

6767
7.
Dr. F R E E's

E D I T I O N

OF THE

Rev. Mr. *John Wesley's*

SECOND LETTER,

With *Prolegómena* for the better Information of
the studious *English* Reader: And a perpetual
Comment upon the original Text, addressed to
the Reverend Author.

Simili frondescit Virga Metallo

VIRGIL.

Τέρον γέγοντα παιδαγωγῆσαι σ' ἐγώ.

Tragedus Vetus.

L O N D O N:

Printed for the AUTHOR; and sold by WILLIAM SANDBY, near
Temple Bar; J. SCOT, and R. STEVENS, in *Pater-noster-row*;
S. PARKER, in *Oxford*; and at the *Royal Exchange*, 1759.
(Price One Shilling.)

1167
4



PROLEGOMENA,

O R,

FORE-READINGS, &c.

SINCE it has happened through the Artifice of our *modern* Teachers, who make it their Business to disturb weak Minds, and to draw Money from the Disturbance; that many well-disposed People of the lower Class, to whom Providence had allotted other Sort of Cares, have been seduced from attending the Duties of common Life, their proper Calling, to spend their Time in reading religious Disputes, and perplex themselves with the knavish Subtleties of crafty Men: I thought it would be no unkind Office, seeing that they will be so engaged, to help them a little through the Difficulties of their new Employment, by laying before them some of those *Rules* and *Distinctions*, which the Learned have thought proper to observe, in order to guard themselves from the *Errors* of *Controversy*; which, without such Marks and Directions, would be a Wilderness to the Understanding, and a *Labyrinth* that never ends.

The *English* Reader then is to understand, that in every Dispute, there are some Things

granted on both Sides, while others remain to be determined.

The Things *granted* are called in the *Greek* διδόμενα, in the *Latin* DATA, by which Name, through the Disuse of our own Words, they are sometimes called in *English*; or else *Axioms* or *Maxims*; as Things of prime Evidence, and *worthy of all Men to be received*.

Now the *Maxims*, or *Things granted* in this Controversy between me and Mr. *Wesley*, with Respect to the Credit of the Christian Religion, for which we both profess a common Concern, I take to be these, that follow.

MAXIMS *respecting the Credit of the Christian Religion.*

MAXIM 1st. That the RELIGION of *Jesus Christ*, or the GOSPEL, is a true Religion.

MAXIM 2. That *Jesus Christ* and his *Apostles* preached one and the same Doctrine.

Agreeable to those Texts of Scripture, *Jesus Christ* the same Yesterday, to Day, and for ever (*Heb. 13. 8.*) For tho' the Enthusiasts of that Age, said, *I am of Paul, and I am of Apollos*, &c. (*i. Cor. 1. 12.*) Yet it appears from the very same Scripture, that *Christ is not divided*.

MAXIM 3. That supposing there were not an Uniformity between the Doctrine of *Christ*, and his *Apostles*; in such Case the Authority of *Christ* himself, being the Son of God, would be superiour to that of any one *Apostle*, or of all his *Apostles* put together, (For the Servants are not above their Lord.)

MAXIM 4. That the Christian Religion *being true*, it cannot be opposite to the *Laws of God*.

MAXIM

MAXIM 5. That the Religion of the Gospel contains *practical Rules* and *Precepts*, as well as the *Religion* of the *Jews*, and the *Religion*, or *Law* of *Nature*.

MAXIM 6. That the Precepts or Laws of the Gospel were delivered by Jesus Christ, in Order to have them obeyed. For otherwise it would have been Foolishness to have delivered them. Because to do a thing to no Purpose, and with no Design is *Folly*.

MAXIM 7. That if *Christ* designed, that the Laws of the Gospel should be obeyed, they must not be such as exceed the Powers and Facultie of human Nature, but such as Mankind in general, may in some Sort, obey. For to command Things *Impossible*, is to command, what can never be obeyed.

MAXIM 8. If what the Gospel commands be not impossible; then there must be in Mankind some Degree of *Liberty* or *Power* of Action suitable to the Thing commanded, and which may enable them to perform it: For otherwise the Laws of the Gospel, tho' *possible* to other Beings, would be *impossible* to Men, if they were thus absolutely destitute of all Power to obey them.

MAXIM 9. Moreover the Laws of the Gospel to be practicable, and to command *Obedience* from *Mankind*, must be consistent with each other.

For Instance, if the GOSPEL in *one Place* should command a Man to *stand stock still*, and in *another Place*, command him to *move his Limbs*

Limbs a little, and endeavour to get forward: A Man could not tell, in this Case, how to obey the GOSPEL: Because receiving both Precepts upon the same Authority, he is as much obliged by the same Authority to obey the one, as to obey the other: But since to *move*, and to *stand still*, at the same Time, are inconsistent, it is *impossible* when a Man is commanded to *do both together*, that he should do *either*. And therefore the Gospel, to command Obedience, must be *consistent* with itself; those who make it otherwise, render it useless, scandalous, and ridiculous.

MAXIM 10. The *general Tenor* of the Gospel, or the *collective Body* of its *Precepts*, and likewise of its *Doctrines*, is not to give Way to a *single Text*. For at this Rate a Part would out weigh, and be greater than the whole.

MAXIM 11. Further any *Text* of the New Testament, which shall contradict the general *Tenor* of the GOSPEL, and the *Light of Nature*, cannot be true.

(Corollary.) And therefore as the Gospel was before allowed to be true, any *Text* alleged as capable of such Contradiction must be a *Text* that is *misinterpreted*.

MAXIM 12. The Religion of Christ being allowed to be *true*, and consequently *uniform*, the *Misinterpreters* of Scripture, who thus busy themselves in finding *Contradictions* in it, and publishing the same for *Doctrines* of the
GOSPEL

GOSPEL, must be ignorant, or dishonest Men, or both together.

MAXIM 13. *Ignorant* and *dishonest* Men are not fit to be *Teachers*, or *Preachers*.

MAXIM 14. PREACHERS misinterpreting the Gospel through *Ignorance* or *Dishonesty*, or both together, hurt the Cause of *Christianity*, and strengthen the Cause of *Infidels*, who triumph in the Weakness of such Pastors, and make their *Concessions* and *Doctrines* an Handle to expose Religion.

MAXIM 15. PREACHERS thus misinterpreting the Gospel; and appealing to the *Authority* of the Church of *England*, in Support of such *Misinterpretations*, highly disgrace the Doctrine of Church of *England*.

The End of the Maxims.

As a farther *Prevention* of ERROR, it may not be improper to subjoin to these a few DEFINITIONS or EXPLICATIONS of certain *Theological* Terms and Phrases, which being capable of various Meanings, the *Methodist* Teachers use them *undefined*, that their *Æquivocation* may confuse the Minds of their Hearers, and render them more subservient to their delusive Purposes. To prevent which let the Reader observe.

EXPLICATION, I.

That the Word GRACE in Scripture primarily signifies *Favour*. It has other Meanings indeed else where, such as *Beauty*, *Decency*, *Decorum*, but among Christians *Favour* is its general Meaning in religious Matters.

Ex-

EXPLICATION 2. Retaining this Sense, but used *Rhetorically*, or by a *Figure*, it may stand for the whole of the *Christian Religion*, because that is a *favourable Religion*. In *St. Paul's Writings*, the whole *Christian Dispensation* is often called by the Name of *Grace*, to distinguish it from the *Law* of the *Jews*; which as it laboured with many *Ceremonies*, is therefore by Way of *Opposition* or *Disesteem*, for its *Labouriousness*, styled *Works*.

EXPLICATION 3. When the Apostle speaks of such *WORKS*, or being *saved without them*, he does not mean *Morality* or *Christian Virtue*, but *Jewish Ceremonies*.

EXPLICATION 4. Of the Derivation of the Word *GRACE*. It comes from the Latin *Gratia*, which is usually put to explain the Word (χάρις) *Karis* in the *Greek Testament*: This Greek Word (χάρις) *Kharis* has several Meanings: It is sometimes rendered into *English* by the Word *Charity*, tho' in itself it signifies sometimes *Gracefulness*, sometimes *Kindness*, and *Affection*; to which last Sense it is generally restrained in Scripture. Thus the *Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ*, in *Greek*, signifies the *Favour* or *Affection of Jesus Christ*, but does not specify any *particular Marks* or *Degrees* of it.

EXPLICATION 5. The Word *Justification*, as used by some *School Divines*, has two Meanings; it is either *initial*, or *final*: If this *Distinction* be not observed, the Word *Justification* must lead People, as indeed it has, into many *dangerous Errors*.

Ex-

EXPLICATION 6. *Initial* JUSTIFICATION is proper to *Profelytes*, and means little, if any Thing, more than their *Conversion* to the Christian Faith. Good *Works* may follow this *Sort* of JUSTIFICATION, but if they do not, it is all undone again; the Man *relapses* from his *justified* State, may continue in his *Relapse*, and notwithstanding such *Sort* of JUSTIFICATION may be *damn'd* at last, so improper in this Case, is the Use of a *Pbrase*, to which People are so apt to fix an Idea of *Salvation*.

EXPLICATION 7. Observe therefore, that it is with a View to this *imperfect* Sense of the Word only, that our 12th *Article* of Religion affirms, that good Works which are the Fruit of Faith *do follow after Justification*, by which the Authors meant no more than *Conversion*, and so far they are right. For a Man must be *converted* to the Christian Faith, before he can *practise* it. If he continue in a Course of Virtue, and observe the Precepts of our Saviour to the last, that *Continuance* in well-doing, which follows his *initial* or *first Justification*, will *precede*, or go before the *final*.

EXPLICATION 8. Further, it deserves particular Notice, that it is only the *final* Justification (which happens not till Death) that can ensure *Salvation*: and that these several Sorts of *Justification* so essentially differ, that good *Works*, which follow the *Initial*, do always go before the *Final*, and under the *Favour* of Christ, and the *Application* of his *Merits*, are the *Cause* or *Condition* of our *Salvation*. For in

some Respects a *Condition* is a *Cause*, as you will see in the following Instance.

Suppose a poor *Labourer* be permitted to inhabit a *Cottage* upon the Waste, upon *Condition* of his paying a *Pepper-Corn* the Year for Rent, to the *Lord* of the *Manor*: The *Acknowledgment* is small indeed for an Habitation, but yet for all that, under the Favour of the Lord, this small Acknowledgment, or Observation of the *Condition* is the *Cause* of holding it.

The End of the EXPLICATIONS.

The State of the Controversy between Mr. Wesley and me.

Having said thus much of the *Maxims*, or *Data*, which I expect to be *granted* in this *Dispute*, and added an *Explication* of the *Terms*, which are most capable of *Æquivocation*, or misuse, I proceed to speak of the Articles in *Question*, which may be divided into *two CLASSES*: because they are somewhat of a *different Nature*, and debated at *different Times*.

The first in Time are those contained in a *Pamphlet*, which I had occasion to address to the Company of *Salters* in LONDON, who were then solicited to choose a *Methodist* to a Lecture in the City.

Mr. *Wesley*, upon the Perusal of this Piece, writes me his *first* Letter, denying "that the
" *Methodists* held any such Opinions, as in this
" Pamphlet I had charged upon them; but
" allowing withal, that if they did hold such
" Opinions, their fatal Tendency was such,

as

“ as I there represented.” The Reader is to note, that this was the *first*, and *principal* Point in Controversy, “ whether they held such “ Opinion or not.”

This Letter from Mr. *Wesley* was not received till I was publishing my SERMON, preached before the University of *Oxford*, entitled, “ Rules for the Discovery of false Prophets,” &c. in which, or in the *Dedication Preface*, or *Appendix* to the same, having brought such Proofs as literally, and to a Title supported the Accusation in the former Treatise: (for I had been urged to this Service by some nameless Opponents, who to shew their Parts, were desirous to be before-hand with Mr. *Wesley*) I thought it would be sufficient to acquaint him, as I did at the End of the *Preface* to my Sermon, then in the Press, “ that if he “ were not thereby convinced, that such *Posi-
“ tions*, as he calls them, were held by People, “ who pass under the Denomination of *Me-
“ thodists*, and would please to signify, that “ want of Conviction, in a private Letter, by “ the same Hand, which conveyed to me the “ former Papers, he should have the Civility of “ a particular Answer, Paragraph by Para-
“ graph, if he thought it necessary, &c.”

Mr. *Wesley* did not choose however to give me this private Information, but for Ostentation, I suppose, or to preserve his Credit with the Sect, by still appearing to be their Advocate in Print, he publishes a *second Letter*; he assigns indeed other *Motives* for the Publication, the

Propriety of which, I shall consider in my Comment upon the Place, wherein they stand.

What I have to observe here by Way of Introduction, concerning this *second Letter* from Mr. *Wesley*, is that it produced not only my *Reply* to his *first*, in the Form of *Annotations*, but that it has also afforded some *new Matter* for *Controversy*, not quite so *material* indeed, as that relating to the *main Question*, about the *Principles* of the *Methodists*, which was the *sole Object* of Debate at first.

Whereas now beside this, here are Objections raised, either against the Truth of some *Facts*, related in the *Dedication* or *Preface* to my Sermon, concerning the *Rise* and *Progress*; the *History* and *State* of *Methodism*; or against my Manner of treating these Subjects, supposing what I had said upon them, to be true.

As to these *new Matters* then since called in *Question*, or *misrepresented* by Mr. *Wesley*, I have only to observe, that they shall be examined in their Places, and set in a true Light, yet not so as to hinder the *Reader's* view of the *main Question*, to wit.

“ Whether the *Methodists* held or published
 “ such Doctrines, as I had charged upon them
 “ in my Pamphlet to the *Salters*,” which in the second Edition, I call a DISPLAY of the *bad Principles* of the *Methodists*, I have informed the *Reader* that this was the Piece, which moved Mr. *Wesley* to write me his *first Letter*, wherein he undertook to make an Apology for all the *Methodists* in general, without

out distinguishing *Particulars*, but in his *second*, he appears to have *contracted* his Defence, and craves Allowance only for himself, his *Brother*, and his *Quondam* associate Mr. *Whitfield*, and then sneaks off, leaving all the Rest to Mercy, who are so far from making any Defence against the Charge, that they *confess the Fact*, and glory in the *Accusation*.

So that the *Reader* is likely to find this Point very clear, *viz.* “that the Generality of the *Methodists* hold to this Day, the blasphemous, and “atheistical Principles, that I mentioned;” and notwithstanding that Mr. *Wesley* at present, professes to have renounced them, as * *horrid and detestable*, yet I am afraid it will appear in the Course of the Evidence, that he was formerly pretty deep in the same Opinions; and consequently, that I was much to be justified in charging in general, the *same Principles* upon People, who had confessedly been of the *same Denomination*. I have indeed in great Measure anticipated the Business of a Reply to his *second Letter*, by the full Evidence I gave upon these Articles in my *Answer* to the *first*: However the *Reader* may not be displeased to see additional Testimonies upon this Head; as he may desire likewise to be better informed about the *new Matters*, which have been started since; so bearing this *State of the Controversy* in Mind, he may now, if he pleases attend the Examination of Mr. *Wesley's* particular *Arguments* and

* *First Letter to Dr. Free, Ch. iii. v. 4. Dr. Free's Edition.*

Objections, which mostly deserve *Ridicule*, at other Times a little *serious Remonstrance*.

Sic Sermone opus est modo tristi sæpe jocosò, HOR.

In either Case, I believe I shall have it in my Power to avoid *Prolixity*, as Mr. *Wesley's* Letter is not only short, but excepting its *Falshoods*, in many Passages so insignificant, as not to merit *Observation*, or *Answer*.



The Reverend Mr. WESLEY'S
Second Letter to Dr. FREE,
 divided into Chapter and Verse, by the *Editor*.

C H A P. I.

The CONTENTS Mr. WESLEY sets out with a Paradox: He expresses his great Desire to live peaceably with all Men, but chooses to shew that Desire by carrying on the War for the Methodists; under the Pretence of being publickly called upon to vindicate himself, though that be the Reverse of what was demanded by his Opponent, and out of the Course of the Dispute; which required a general Defense of the Methodists, which at first he undertook, but in this Letter, after a few idle Cavils, is obliged to drop.

Fonmon Castle, *August*, 24, 1758.

REVEREND SIR,

I. **I**N the Preface to your Sermon lately printed, you mention your having received my former Letter, and add, That "if the Proofs you have now brought do not satisfy me as to the Validity of your former Assertions: If I am not yet convinced, that such Positions are held, by People who pass under the Denomination of *Methodists*, and will signify this by a private Letter, I shall have a more particular Answer." I desire to live peaceably with all Men; and should therefore wish for no more, than a private Answer to a private Letter, did the Affair lie between you and me. But this is not the Case: You have already appealed, to the Archbishop, the University, the Nation. Before these Judges you have advanced a Charge of the highest Kind, not only again me, but a whole Body of People. Before these I therefore must either confess the Charge, or give in my Answer.

Dr. FREE's Comment upon the Revd.

Mr. W E S L E Y 's 2d Letter addressed to
 Mr. *Wesley*.

REVEREND SIR,

HAVING in the Course of this Dispute, in great Measure exhausted my Stock of Compliments, and being unwilling to offer you
 a few

Mr. Wesley's Second Letter.

2. But you say, "I charge Blasphemy, Impiety, &c. upon the Profession of *Methodism* in general. I use no *personal* Reflections upon you, or any Investive against you, but in the Character of a *Methodist*." That is, you first say, "All *Methodists* are Pickpockets, Rebels, Blasphemers, Atheists." And then add, "I use no Reflections upon you, but in the Character of a *Methodist*." But in the Character of a Pickpocket, Blasphemer, Atheist." None but? What can you do more?

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

a few *Flowers*, unless I had found Materials sufficient for a compleat *Noségay*, I have omitted, for this Time the *sweet Savour* of a DEDICATION, and substituted in it's stead, a short but useful Entertainment, which I call my *Prolegómena*. I address it indeed to the *Reader*; but *under the Rose*, as it contains, what I take to be a *true State* of the *Controversy*, it may keep us from *Rambling*, and be of some Service to *You* and *Me*, as we shall find; perhaps if we have *Recourse* to it upon some *particular* Occasions.

For Instance now, in your *first* Letter you say, "all that you concern yourself about is my "*five* vehement *Affertions* with Regard to the "*People* called *Methodists*".—and yet in your *second* you affirm that—"if a thousand Sets of Men, "*pass* under that *Denomination*, they are "*nothing* to you.—"You are no way concerned for their Principles or Practice." &c.

If you apply to the *Prolegómena*, I believe you will see that this is changing the *Controversy*; and that you are some how or other got on the *wrong Side* of the *Post*. And therefore would it not have been better to have

have followed my *Advice*, and given me your *Opinion*, or Recantation in *Private*, than thus to have summoned, as you declare you do, the *Archbishop*, the *University* nay the whole *Nation* together, to hear you *contradict* yourself?

From this short View of a Scheme so ill laid and so *contradictory*, it becomes very difficult to understand your *Exordium*, which in the Nature of the Thing, should have given us a clear and distinct Idea of what you proposed to maintain, and the Manner, wherein you intended to draw up your Defence.

“ Before these *Judges*”. You tell me (that is before the Archbishop, the University and the Nation) “ that I have advanced a Charge of the highest Kind not only against you, but against an whole Body of People, &c.

The Charge, Sir, how high and of what Kind soever has been and may be again, and again made good, if you think it prudent ever again to require it: but observe Sir, that you may not wrap yourself up in your Delusions, and think that no body sees you because you see nothing yourself, that the Word Charge, as you here use it, appears to have a double Meaning.

All the Charge that I know of against you in particular is that of being the Father of the *Methodists*: And can you disown the Title here, when in your † Pamphlet called the *Character* of a *Methodist*, you take to the Thing so cordially yourself? Any otherwise than in this

† P. 1.
C Capacity;

Capacity, where your Name is not mentioned, the Charge is not against you in particular, but the *Sect* in general, all who bear the Name, and come within the *Definition*, which, to fix their Character, I gave of the *Methodists*, in the Preface to my Sermon.

This then being premised about the *Charge*, let us hear how you proceed in the *Defence*.—

“Before these,” you say (that is the *Audience*, which in your *Imagination* attend you, the *Archbishop*, the *University*, the *Nation*,
In Vacuo Sessor Plausrque Theatro,)

You must either confess the *Charge*, or give in your Answer”. It may be necessary therefore to ask you which *Charge* you mean, the Charge against yourself in particular, or the Charge against the *Methodists* in general; as likewise what you would understand by your *Answer*, whether an Answer for *yourself*, or an Answer for *them*.

For after much shuffling and casting about for Expedients, it is plain at last, that you admit the *Charge* against *them*, and give in the *Answer* only for *yourself*. For you say* (Chap. ii.) “I shall not concern myself with any Thing
 “in the Appendix but what relates to me in
 “particular”.—very well!

This short Enquiry then being made, to know more precisely what you would be at, namely that you no longer answer for the *Methodists* in general, but only for *yourself*, or those in *Partnership* with *yourself*: Let us now try the Cause upon this Issue, and hear how you begin your *Apology*, why truly not by stating

* Chap. ii. Verse 4. of this Edition.

your *own Opinions*, but by a Method the most remote from your Purpose in the World.

By running foul of my Writings and making a Blundering or *base* Misquotation from thence where the Subject affords not any Thing for your Vindication, and has no Manner of Relation in particular to yourself, the whole Passage referring very clearly to the Case of Mr. *Ven*.

For the Reader's Satisfaction I will produce the very Words* "What I have said of scandalous Opposition to the Church of *England*—Blasphemy, Impiety, &c. is charged upon the Profession of *Methodism* in general, I use no personal Reflections upon Mr. *V*— nor any Invektive against him, but in the Character of a *Methodist*". These are my Words confined and limited as well by the *Initial* Letter of his *Name*, as by the *Sense* and Argument, to the *Individual* Mr. *Ven*. And yet you represent it to the Reader as tho' I had said in this Passage, that "I use no personal Reflections upon *You*."!—Pray, Sir, how comes it about that you so suddenly take the Shape of Mr. *Ven*, or that Mr. *Ven* so suddenly takes the Shape of Mr. *Wesley*? This untimely Appearance of two *Sofias* upon the Stage at once, has discovered too much of the *Plot*, and at the same Time so puzzled the *Action*, that it is impossible for the *Audience*, (and consider whom, you represent that *Audience* to be) to know which is performing his *Part*, unless you leave them

* Preface to the Sermon before the *University of Oxford*. p. iv. new Edit.

some *Mark*, whereby to distinguish for the future *yourself* from your *t'other self*.

*Certe, ædepol, quum illum contemplo, & Formam cognosco tuam;
Quemadmodum in Speculum inspexi; nimis similis est Tui.*

Upon the whole, this was a capital Mistake. The SPIRIT of *Deception* played you a Trick here, Sir, to discover to us, or leave us so much Room to suspect, that you had such a notable *Coadjutor* as Mr. *Wen*, and that you were forced lay your *inspired* Noddles together and club for such a Production as this, and then as in most promiscuous Generations, be puzzled yourselves or puzzle the World, to know which was the real Father.

Verse 2. As to the Offence you take at my calling Mr. *Ven*, or *You*, a *Methodist*, (for at present we cannot tell which is which,) and asking me what *I could do more*? I think by your own Account, that *I could do more*, and that the Matter does not deserve so much of your Resentment as it might, if Things were aggravated. For if the *Methodists* have been branded with all the *ignominious* Names, you here repeat, such as *Pick-pockets*, *Rebels*, *Blasphemers*, *Atheists*, I certainly use *Him* or *You* with the greater Civility, if in the Room of these I give you the *gentler* Appellation. For I would by no means press you with the Name of *Pick-pocket*, as I have a Suspicion, that it would
cause

cause Offence; it not being clear to me, that you have any visible Way of getting Money, that the LAW allows; may I ask you? Are you within the ACT of Toleration? I do not dwell upon this: Neither have I Time to examine Mr. *Whitfield's* Accounts, or to enquire whether the Orphan-house in *Georgia* be now made the private PROPERTY of a particular Person? Or whether the *Fools-pence* that were gathered in the *Fields*, under the Pretext of serving that Charity, were intended by the Donors to be converted into private PROPERTY, any more than the Situation and Materials of some large *Tabernacles* here at home? The Persons, who have been concerned this Way are those, to whom such *Inquisition* properly belongs. In my Sermon before the *University* of OXFORD, I only laid down RULES for the Discovery of false Prophets, which Rules I left to other People to apply as they saw Occasion: For I am not of the *Grand Jury*, nor bound to prepare the Indictments, or find the Bills.

For my Part, I am very sorry you introduced the Word *Pick-pocket*, for I do not remember, that in all our Correspondence, I ever honoured you with such a Name. I must ask you one Question too, about the Word *Rebel*.—I have complained indeed of the Principles of the *Methodists* as dangerous to any STATE, and particularly our own Constitution, but where did I ever expressly call a *Methodist* a *Rebel*? I am afraid this is another of the dishonest Liberties which you make no Scruple to take in altering my Words and Phrases --- A REBEL is a
Traitor

3. But this, you say, is the Practice of all honest Men, and a Part of the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free. Nay surely there are some honest Men, who scruple using their Opponents in this Manner. At least, I do: Suppose you was an Atheist, I would not bring against you a railing Accusation. I would still endeavour to treat you with Gentleness and Meekness, and thus to shew the Sincerity of my Faith. I leave to you that exquisite "Bitterness of Spirit, and extreme Virulence of Language," which you say is your Duty, and term Zeal. And certainly Zeal, Ferver, Heat, it is. But is this Heat from Above? Is it the Offspring of Heaven? Or a Smoke from the Bottomless Pit?

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

Traitor, who appears in Arms.---I never yet laid such a Thing as this to the Charge of the Methodists. They never, that I know of, appeared in Arms; though if the Government have not a watchful Eye upon them, as their Turbulence and Numbers go on to increase, it is not so unlikely but they may: If there should happen to be a Confusion in the State, what so probable a Course, for a foreign Enemy to take, as to gain over; or if an Invasion succeeds, command their Leaders to join their Party?

As to their Behaviour in other Respects, I have allowed you already, that some People may be better, than their Principles would incline us to think of them; and that is all the Concession I can make, for I must still contend, that by their Principles, those People are capable of doing any Thing, who profess, as some of the Methodists in their Writings do, to make no Distinction between Good and Evil, and rail at the common People in their Harangues for still regarding, what they call their nasty sinking

ing good Works, so mean is their Opinion of moral Virtue.

Verse 3. Sir, of your Letter discovers in the Beginning how honest you are in making Extracts from the Writings of your Opponents and obliges me in Justice to the Reader, and myself to produce at Length the Passage, you have thus perverted in the Preface to my Sermon, my Words are these. "But if all this be true why should it not be *said* the *Scripture* declares (*Gal. iv. 18.*) that it is our Duty to be *zealously affected in a good Thing* and can there be any thing better than the Cause of God? Where this is concerned I am not to regard the Persons of Men, or treat with *Gentleness, Meekness, Mildness.*" Those, who with the Face of *Meekness* are doing the Work of *Atheists*, but I am rather to shew the *Sincerity* of my *Faith*, by what, they are pleased to consider as it's Reproach, the Heartiness of the Zeal, wherewith I oppose them. This will lay me under a Necessity of using such *Words*, whether they sound agreeable or not, as by the *common Consent* of Mankind belong to such and such Persons, or such and such Things, which is the Practice of all *honest* Men, and which, as they found occasion, was the Practice of *Christ* and his *Apostles,*" &c.

As for your professed Civility to *Atheists* I think you may be ashamed of it: For in my Opinion a *Government* would be scandalous both before God and Man, that should suffer them to *propagate* their Opinions, or treat them,

if

4. O Sir, whence is that Zeal which makes you talk in such a Manner to his Grace of Canterbury? I lay before you the *Disposition of an Enemy who threaten our Church with a general Alteration or total Subversion: Who interrupt us as we walk the Streets, (Whom? When? Where?) in that very Dress, which distinguishes us as Servants of the State, (Altogether Servants of the State?) in the now sad Capacity of Ministers of the falling Church of England. Such being the prostrate, miserable Condition of the Church, and such the triumphant State of its Enemies, none of the English Priesthood can expect better Security or longer Continuance than the rest. They all subsist at Mercy.—Your Grace and those of your Order will fare no better than those of our own.* Sir, are you in earnest? Do you really believe *Lambeth* is on the Point of being blown up?

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

if they discovered themselves, with *Gentleness*, or *Meekness*. And as for that exquisite *Bitterness of Spirit* and extreme *Virulence of Language* which you have the *Modesty* to say, I esteem *my Duty*; I must tell you, since you will not apprehend, that these Phrases are none of mine, but the impudent Imputation of your own Party.

— *Verse 4.* My Zeal (since you ask me whence it is) which impelled me so earnestly to address his GRACE of Canterbury, proceeds from my Concern for the Church of ENGLAND.

I see it deserted by some People at the *Helm*, who, if they were *Constitutionists*, would think themselves in *Duty* bound to preserve the *political* System of ENGLAND, of which the Church and Clergy are a *Part*: The *Violation* of these is a *Violation* of the *Constitution*: and therefore I put them in Mind, that in this Department, we are the *LEGAL Servants of the State*, and as such ought not to be *injured*,
sensible

sensible though, at the the same Time, that we sustain a much *higher* Character, namely that of the Embassadors of *Jesus Christ*; but to what Purpose would it be to mention such a Circumstance to People, whose Behaviour affords you the strongest Reason to suspect how *little* they regard him. As for the *Ministers* of State in *England*, is not long ago since *some* of them were taxed with a *strange* Inclination to the * *Jews*.

Others have the Credit of being Authors of a very extraordinary † Law, which compells the *Clergy* without their *Consent*, first obtained (their being no *Convocation* then sitting) to perform a certain *Office* at the Hazard of their Lives and Liberties; which is a kind of Treatment very *unchristian*: Others again, who have borne *high Offices* and been † *Secretaries* of STATE have been open Patrons of *Infidelity*. The *religious Principles* therefore of these People being unsettled and *unknown*, (as yours may be) it would be idle to apply to them in such their *uncertain* Character, but as they *always* profess to be *Servants* of the *Constitution*, and of his *Majesty King GEORGE*; I therefore appeal to them, in *what they profess*; desiring them to be *consistent* with their *Profession*; being assured, that they will hurt his *Majesty* very much, if they appear to use his Authority, to hurt the *Church* of *ENGLAND*.

The *Insults* offered to the *regular Clergy* in

* The *Jew-Bill*.

† *Marriage-Act*.

† *Bolingbroke*.

every Place, where the *Methodists* have been permitted to encrease, have been for some Years past so notorious, that every one, who resides in such Places, must wonder at your want of Modesty in making these Things a Question. I am persuaded that you yourself are not a Stranger to the — *whom? when? where?* as you term it. You are well acquainted with *Bristol*. Did you never hear, that Dr. *Tucker* now Dean of *Gloucester*, when it was his Fortune to be engaged with the *Methodists*, as it is now mine, gave this Account of their Behaviour?

“ Some of Mr. *Whitfield's* Followers have
 “ *insulted* and *reviled* me in *passing along the*
 “ *Streets*, and declared, that they looked up-
 “ on me as the *Enemy of God*, and his *Reli-*
 “ *gion*. This was owing to Mr. *Whitfield's*
 “ pointing at me so often in his Prayers, and
 “ describing me in his *Harangues* to the
 “ People, &c.” See more of this in the *London Magazine*. For JULY 1739. Pag. 341.

Of such Abuses offered to the Clergy in *these Parts*, as well as *Bristol*, there have been Instances too many to be here recited, for they would fill a Volume of themselves. Nay, the Outrages are sometimes so excessive as to be attended not only with great Danger to the Person who is the Object of their Fury, but also with such an insolent Breach of the *Peace* as shews that in their religious Phrenzy, these People set the *Laws* and *Magistrates* themselves at *Defiance*. We see this in the Case of the Revd. Mr.

C.—who after Preaching at St. *Olave's* was not only insulted in the Church, but pursued by these People on the *Lord's Day*, like so many *Hell-hounds* quite over *London Bridge*. What their Behaviour was to me at *Bermondsey Church* is related in the Remonstrance to the *Bishop of Winchester* prefixed to my SPEECH to the *London Clergy*. And besides the Riot then committed by their collective Body; they have often met me singly since, threatening me with the Consequences of giving *Opposition* to their *Cause*, and signifying amongst other Things, that they had it in their Power to hurt the *Income* of my *Lecture* at *Newington*, and that I must expect to feel their *Power* and *Influence* in that Quarter.

Was it a Wonder, Sir, that in Times like these I should say, that the *Clergy* “sublist at “*Mercy*” or tell his GRACE, “that in a “*general* Defection of the People his *Grace*, “and those of the *Episcopal* Order, would “fare no better than ourselves.” You ask me indeed upon this very triumphantly.—“Sir, “are you in earnest? Do you think that “*Lambeth* is on the Point of being blown “up.”—Since you will have it then, let me tell you, Sir, that this *Sneer* carries with it an *Air* of *Confidence* and *Complacency*; which had better been concealed. For it discovers your inward *Assurance* of *Success*, which however covered upon some Occasions, is at other Times *pulished* in a very particular Manner. You may imagine, that we sometimes see the

publick *News Papers*, which are continually made the Trumpeters of the *Success* of your *Party*, and the Increase of your Power and Fame.

When one of your Saints departed, the *Gazetteer* of *Wednesday Jan. 1759*. Informed us, “from *Abergavenny*, that a *Gentlewoman* of that Place to testify her Regard for the Memory of the late *Worthy*, the Reverend Mr. *James Hervey*, went into Mourning, though no Ways related to him.”— From Mr. *Whitfield's* great *Booth*, we had a pompous Article on *Saturday* the 20th of *October*, 1759, in the *St. James's Evening Post*.

How that the Day before “the Reverend Mr. *Whitfield* preached three *Thanksgiving* Sermons, two in the Morning at the *Tabernacle*, and one at his Chapel at *Tottenham Court*, to numerous Audiences of Persons of Distinction.” By which it appears that being without Law, he did not think it Decency to wait till his MAJESTY appointed the Day of *Thanksgiving*; but pert, forward, an *Enthusiastick* sounds his own Trumpet, sets up his own Standard, and is attended in his Irregularities by numerous Audiences of Persons of Distinction: Though if there be such a Number of them, it may be some Importance to the People of *England* to know who these Persons of Distinction were.—But to return Mr. *W*— is not singular in this Practice. There is something of the same Magnificence in yourself. When your GRACE leaves your *Castle* of

of * *Mock-fun-man* in Ireland, to return to England, it is given out as an Event as considerable as the Return of a *Lord Lieutenant*.

And when the other *Mock-Archbishop*, Mr. *Whitfield* returns from his Visitation in Scotland, he publishes it more than once. The *Daily Advertiser* of Friday October, 27, 1758, has this Paragraph. "For this Month past, we hear, the Reverend Mr. *Whitfield* has been preaching twice a Day to very large Auditories, in various Parts of *Yorkshire*, *Lancashire*, and *Staffordshire*, and is expected in Town this Week."—And again Saturday, October, 28. "On Thursday Evening the Reverend Mr. *Whitfield* came to Town from Scotland, and the North of England, and we hear, preaches To-morrow at *Tottenham Court Chapel*, and the *Tabernacle* in *Moorfields*."—That is, in plain English, giving us to understand, that in all these Counties or Places, he had been seducing many of his MAJESTY's poor Subjects from their proper Pastors, and (which is the Consequence of their Revolt) leaving them in a State of *Cabal* and *Ferment*. These are the Proceedings, which in my Opinion threaten the Church of ENGLAND, with a general Alteration, or total Sub-version, in which Case, I apprehend his Grace, and those of his Order, would be in some Danger, as well as the inferior Clergy, in this Crisis though, it seems you have your Eye upon the Palace at LAMBETH, which I had never mentioned: but

* This Letter of Mr. *Wesley's* is dated from *Fen-mon* Castle.

however,

5. You go on. *In the remote Countries of England, I have seen a whole Troop of these Divines on Horseback, travelling with each a Sister behind him.* O Sir. "what should be great, you turn to Farce." Have you forgot, that the Church and Nation are on the brink of Ruin? But pray when and where did you see this? In what Year? Or in what Country? I cannot but fear, you take this Story on trust: For such a Sight, I will be bold to say, was never seen.

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

however, as you ask me whether I think it on the Point of being *blown up*. I answer very seriously, that I suppose, *when he has got Possession of it, JOHN by Divine Providence, will take Care of THAT.*

Verse 5. "You say, O Sir, what should be "great, you turn to Farce."--- By the *Commas* about this Sentence, I saw that it was meant as a *Quotation*, and had Reference to some *Author*, but I could not presently recollect from which of our *English* Divines you gathered it, at Length I was informed that it belonged to a Poem of Mr. *Prior's*, called the *Ladle*, and that the Couplet of Verses stood thus.

*What should be great, you turn to Farce.
I would the LADLE in your---*

This Ladle Sir, which you kept in *Petto*, considering how the Author has placed it, will make but an odd Appearance in a Theological Treatise. It is really surprizing to see how *Doctors* differ; some of them, as I have heard have written *de Virginibus velandis*, and others it seems *de nudandis Vetulis*. But did you really take your Quotation from the Passage
above-

abovementioned? If so, it is a *Farce* indeed. But it is a *Farce* of your own making, and wherein you are likely to be the *principal* ACTOR. Let any one conceive the *Apostolical* Mr. JOHN WESLEY. How old are you?—Well, such a one as *Wesley*, (*ὁ πρεσβύτερος*) the aged, with the same *demure* Countenance, that you wear in your *new* Picture, where you are represented as a *Firebrand*:—(Who bid you call yourself a *Firebrand*?) I say with the same *demure* Countenance fixed in deep Contemplation upon such an *Object* as is here represented,—(*quod Ego nunquam vidi, neque velim*) and I defy Mr. *Hogarth* with all his Humour to entertain us with a *Scene*, which shall have more of the *high* RIDICULOUS.

But, Sir, your *Merriment*, though at your own Expence must not divert me from my *serious* Purpose. I look upon the Times to be dangerous, and seditious, when a Parcel of *fanatical* People, Men and Women-preachers shall thus *travel* the *Country* disturbing the *Majesty's* poorer Subjects, and giving them ill Impressions against the *National* Religion, as it is taught by their *regular* Ministers.

If the same *Liberty* was allowed to a *Troop* of *Popish* Priests, the *Country*, and that justly, would be *up in Arms* about it; and therefore I see no Reason, why People, who wish well to the Constitution, should so quietly behold the Increase, and *turbulent* Proceedings of the *Methodists*. Since their *Enthusiasm* is in many Respects *similar*, in other Respects *worse* than *POPERY*, and as capable of being heated to attempt

tempt any *Revolution* in the STATE. In support of this Assertion I appeal to the Observation of a worthy *Dutch* Clergyman, who though, what we call a *Dissenter* or *Presbyterian*, yet being a truly sensible * Man and alarmed at the *Growth* of these People *abroad*: (For all *Religions* ought to be aware of them) speaks forth the *Words of Truth* and *Soberness* upon this Occasion. "When *Fanaticism*" says he, "has got the *upper Hand*, and works "with all it's Forces, it is not only able to corrupt RELIGION, but to overthrow civil Society. The Spirit, which animates it, is too eminent, too divine, to subject itself to any human Power: On the Contrary, all must buckle to, and obey it's Orders. A *Fanatic* in his *Dreams*, often sees an *earthly Kingdom*, where the *Faithful* are to exercise an *absolute Power* over the WORLD. Now if he is supported by a powerful Party, why should he not take it into his Head that "the Time is come?" The Author proceeds farther and for the Conviction of his Brethren bids them cast their Eyes upon the Impieties and Excesses committed at *Munster*, of which the Reader may see more in my † Remarks upon the *miraculous Letter* read in the *Pulpit* by Mr. Jones. When I behold Things similar to these in *England*, we may begin to be afraid of the like Consequences. And as you affect to doubt, Sir, of the Truth of some *Facts*

* Mr. *Stinsra* on *Fanaticism* P. 44. translated by Mr. RIMIUS.

† Remarks on Mr. Jones's Letter. p. 54, to 59.

6. With an easy Familiarity you add, *My Lord, permit me here to whisper a Word* (Is not this *Whispering in Print* something new?) that may be worth remembering. In our Memory some of the Priesthood have not proved so good Subjects as might have been expected, till they have been bought over with Preferments, that were due to other People. Meaning, I presume to yourself. Surely his Grace will remember this, which is so well worth remembering, and dispose of the next Preferment in this Gift, where it is so justly due. If he does not, if he forgets either this, or your other Directions, you tell him frankly what will be the Consequence. *We must apply to Parliament* : p. 6. Or to his Majesty. And indeed how can you avoid it? For it will be using him, you think, extremely ill, not to give him proper Information, that there are now a Set of People, offering such Indignity to his CROWN and GOVERNMENT.

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

here related and attempt to turn them to a Jest, by asking when? where? in what Year, and what County I saw this *Carvalcade* of Men and Women Preachers? I will answer particularly. The Year was 1753, the Day of the Month, *October* 8th or 9th, the Place's Name was *Gisburn* in the County of *York*: The *Mercury*, or chief *Speaker* of this Company of *Deaconesses* and travelling *Apostles*, was a Man who had lost an *Arm*, I don't say where he had lost it, but perhaps by this Description, you may know him.

In Verse 6. You think, that you observe an "easy Familiarity" in my saying to the *Archbishop*, "*My Lord permit me,*" &c. Sir the Word *permit*, has been used here in *England* to a crowned Head, and sure that is good enough for an *Archbishop*, which is good enough for a KING.

Where then is the *Familiarity*? If I ask *Per-*
E
mission

mission to approach; it implies, that I find my Self at a *Distance*: And how a Man can be *familiar*, that keeps *his Distance*, I profess I cannot discern: You may be assisted by a *Jealousy*, which may enable you to see Things in another Light: I am not acquainted with your *Connexions* Sir, so leaving this Subject, let us examine your *Whispering in Print*, which you observe to be "*something new*." Something *new* I believe it is: For I never heard of it before. But I know it to be *no new Thing*; to see that *in Print*, which a Man, at some Time or other, may have *desired to whisper*. And therefore to this *Chaff* of WIT, let us apply the *Burning-glass* of REASON, and you shall see it *smoak*, and vanish in a Moment.

Where have I ever said "My Lord permit me to whisper" *in Print*? You perceive now, I suppose, that this is your *Interpolation*; and that the *Novelty* and *Nonsense* are likewise all your own. But how came you to *father* your Absurdities upon me; when at the End of your Letter you say, that you are my *Servant* for *Christ's Sake*? If this be the Way, you serve me for *Christ's Sake*: your *Christian Religion* is a *very odd Religion*; I desire no such *Christian Service*.

As for my next Words, since you are not so *just*, as to give them either a fair *Quotation*, or candid *Construction*, I must tell you, that by *Preferments* due to *other People*, I meant *other People beside* myself, who are neglected to this very Day. I do allow however, that in Consideration of my *Father's* Sufferings in the Time of

K. GEORGE the *first*: And because in the late *Rebellion*, I so strenuously took the Part of his *present* MAJESTY, supported his Cause, defended his Government, and made out his *Pedigree* and Title to the Crown, better than all his *then Ministers* of State, when put together, (for which I was at that Time no more considered notwithstanding the Importance of the Service, than I have been now for writing for the Church of *England*), I did expect after all, that I should have *some* Preferment at *some* Time or other: But *Thomas Holles*, Duke of *Newcastle*, I believe was then *Secetary* of STATE; and *Philip* now called *Earl Hardwick* was then Lord Chancellor. They say, that they went at *that* Time, to *resign* together: But I believe they did not, and I am sensible as well as Mr. *Pitt* and the Nation, that they *are in Power still*, which I take to be the true Reason why I have been so long neglected and oppressed, and that one of *your* Sort should have it now in your Power to play the *Jesuit*, and laugh at me for having thus misapplied my *Time* and *Labour* in defending the *present* KING, and the *present* Church-ESTABLISHMENT. I am obliged to you to be sure for *opening* my Eyes a-little, I suppose you meant among *other* Things, that it should save me for the future some expence in *Paper* and *Print*, and teach me to resolve with *Homer's* Soldier,

*When bleeding GREECE again
Shall call ACHILLES, she shall call in vain.*

POPE.

So

So let it pass: But as *Matters* seem to rest with these *Laymen*, I do not think it was right in you to draw his GRACE of *Canterbury* into your *Conumdrum*; and reflect upon him. For the *World* will be apt enough to do that, without your Assistance, if there be Occasion. And therefore I think it would have became you better to have spared your *Reflections* and stuck to your *Argument*: For by introducing this *Episode* you have so far forgot yourself that I shall convict you of a shocking Falshood in the next Sentence; where you say, that “*I* “*frankly tell the Archbishop, if he forgets* “*to dispose of the next Preferment in his* “*Gift, where it is so justly due, we must apply* “*to Parliament.*” The Words in my Dedication, Sir, have clearly another meaning; I suppose you will be ashamed to see that they are only these! †

“*My LORD, an honest sober Mind must be* “*shocked at these infernal Devices, these* “*strange IDOLS of a new JESUS, and a new* “*FAITH. If such wild Notions were propa-* “*gated only in our high Ways and Hedges,* “*they must soon be attended with fatal Con-* “*sequences. But what shall we say, if the* “*Heathen are come into our Inheritance, and* “*have Permission to occupy our very Churches?* “*Would any Earthly Power, at War with a-* “*nother, suffer the Enemy to erect their Bat-* “*teries within their Walls? Or trust them*

† Dedication to Dr. Free's Sermon at Oxford new Edition. p. v. and vi.

7. However we are not to think, your opposing the *Methodists* was owing to *Self-interest alone*. Tho' what if it was? *Was I to depart from my Duty, because it happened to be my Interest? Did these Saints ever forbear to preach to the Mob in the Fields for fear lest they should get the Pence of the Mob? Or do not the Pence and the Preaching, go Hand in Hand together?* No, they dont: For many Years neither I nor any connected with me, have got any Pence, as you phrase it, *in the Fields*. Indeed, properly speaking, they never did. For the Collections which Mr. *Whitfield* made, it is well known, were not for his own Use, either in whole or in part. And he has long ago given an Account in Print of the Manner wherein all that was received, was expended.

8. But it is not my Design to examine at large, either your Dedication, Preface, or Sermon, I have only Leisure to make a few, cursory Remarks on your *Definition* of the *Methodists* (so called) and on the Account you give of *their first Rise*, of their *Principles* and *Practice*: Just premising, that I speak of those alone, who began (as you observe) at *Oxford*. If a thousand other Sets of Men *pass under that Denomination*, yet they are nothing to me: As they have no Connexion with me, so I am no Way concerned, to answer either for their Principles or Practice: Any more than you are to answer for all who *pass under the Denomination of Church of England-Men*.

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

" with the keeping of the *Citadel*? — WE
 " CANNOT AS PRIESTS OF THE CHURCH OF
 " ENGLAND STAND STILL, AND BEHOLD SUCH
 " A PIECE OF TREACHERY AS THIS. We
 " must apply to our *Commanders*,——If YOUR
 " GRACE, and my LORDS the BISHOPS have
 " not Power sufficient to afford us Redress,—
 " We must apply to Parliament." This is very
 different from your Account. Where is the
 Word *Preferment*?

Verse 7. The Substance of the next Verse, as the *Occasion* required, has been considered under the Word *Pickpocket*, which you unfortunately put in my way, Page the 20. of this Comment. Therefore you and the Reader may consult that Passage if you please. For I de-
 light

9. The Account you give of their Rise is this. *The Methodists began at Oxford. The Name was first given to a few Persons, who were so uncommonly Methodical, as to keep a Diary of the most trivial Actions of their Lives, as how many Slices of Bread and Butter they eat, how many Dishes of Tea they drank, how many Country-Dances they danced at their dancing Club, or after a Fast, how many Pounds of Mutton they devoured. For upon these Occasions they eat like Lions, having made themselves uncommonly voracious.* Of this not one Line is true: For, 1. It was from an antient Sect of Physicians, whom we were supposed to resemble in our regular Diet and Exercise, that we were originally stiled *Methodists*. 2. Not one of us ever kept a Diary of the most trivial Actions of our Lives. 3. Nor did any of us ever set down, what or how much we eat or drank. 4. Our *Dancing-Club* never existed: I never heard of it before. 5. On our *Fast-Days* we used no Food but Bread; on the Day following we fed as on common Days. 6. Therefore our *Voraciousness* and *eating like Lions* is also pure, lively Invention.

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

light not in repeating Grievances, and I believe it will be quite as agreeable to you, to have these Matters forgot.

So we will proceed to *Verse 8.* of this Letter, which I have already observed, contains a Contradiction to the Profession you made in in your *first*. I have only a small Remark to offer here upon the *Manner* of Expression; you say with regard to the other *Methodists*, that "you are no way concerned to answer
" either for *their* Principles or *Practice*, any
" more than I am to answer for all, *who pass*
" *under the Denomination* of Church of England
" Men." I beg your Pardon, Sir, I think our *Case* is somewhat different. For in the *first* Place, I never gave Rise to any of the *disorderly* People of the Church of ENGLAND. Secondly, I never kept them Company: And Thirdly, I never took upon me to write in their Defence.

fence. And therefore by Reason of these *Connexions* you are much more answerable for the *Principles* and *Practices* of the *Methodists*, than I am for the Conduct of the *disorderly* People of the *Church* of ENGLAND, with whom I have no such *Connexions*.

Notwithstanding your quibbling and prævaricating (in *Verse* the 9.) I must insist upon it, that the Account I give of the Rise of the *Methodists* at *Oxford* is in every Circumstance very true. The Person, who gave you this Name, knew nothing in all Probability of any such antient *Seet* of Physicians as you mention; Nor was there any *Similitude* between your Profession and theirs, that could induce him to distinguish you by that Title. Neither did you ever at that Time of the Day pretend to *derive* the *Origin* of your Name from that Occasion yourselves: But having since dipped into Dr. *Freind's* History of *Physick* and met with such a *Seet* of *Physicians*, you thought it would look better if you affected to be their Relations, choosing rather to draw upon you the Denomination of *Quacks*, than that the World should remember your being *nick-named* from the *whimsical Method* of keeping a *Diary* of all your Actions. Which however I know to be Fact, having seen at that Time a *Journal* of that Sort in the Hands of one of your Disciples. And that the Reader may be convinced of the same from other Testimonies, he will not only see the Word *Diary* in the *Dealings* cited by the Lord Bishop of *Exeter* in his Book entitled the *Entbusiasm* of the *Methodists* and *Papists* compared

10. You go on, *It was not long, before these Gentlemen began to dogmatize in a publick Manner, feeling a stron Inclination to new-model almost every Circumstance or Thing in the System of our National Religion.* Just as true as the rest. These Gentlemen were so far from feeling any Inclination at all, to *new-model* any Circumstance or Thing, that during their whole Stay at *Oxford*, they were *High-Churchmen* in the strongest Sense: Vehemently contending for every Circumstance of *Church-Order*, according to the *Old-Model*. And in *Georgia* too, we were rigorous Observers of every *Rubric* and *Cannon*: As well as (to the best of our Knowledge) ever Tenet of the Church. Your Account therefore of the Rise of the *Methodists*, is a Mistake from Beginning to End.

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

pared, part 2. p. 13 of the small Edition: But also find the *Practice* strongly recommended by *Mr. *Hervey*, as a *Method* he had been advised to by an old Friend (most probably yourself) in order to shew People, how often they were amused with *Trifles*, and therefore the *Trifles* must be registered. And if there be any Difference between *trivial Actions*, and being employed on *Trifles*, it is such as, I confess, I cannot discern. As for the *Dancing-Club* at *Christ-Church*, how came your Brother to make a *Poem* upon it, if it never existed? And for your Voraciousness, I think, it might well be said, that you eat like *Lions*, if two of you could devour a Leg of Mutton.

Further you say, *Verse 10.* "That these *Gentlemen* were so far from feeling any Inclination to *new-model*, &c. that during their whole Stay at *Oxford*, they were *High-Churchmen* in the strongest Sense:" Part of this may be true in one of the strong Senses. For otherwise one of your first *Adherents* would scarce have been ready with so much Alacrity

* *Theron and Aspasio*, vol. 2. p. 280.

to have played the *Chaplain* to a certain *Person*, whom they called *his Royal Highness*, at a certain *Place*. This, as you are a *true KING GEORGE'S* Man, can be no *Reflection* upon you; but as you are talking of *old Models*, I am obliged just to ask you, which of the *old Models* you mean: Because I remember, that the Gentleman afore-said, at the *Time* you mention, vehemently contended for mixing *Water* with the *Wine* in the *Holy Sacrament*, which I suppose you may not think quite *so necessary* now, and am therefore persuaded you will allow me to put you in *Mind* of this as a *new Model*, since I believe it to be none of our *SAVIOUR'S Institution*; and to conclude that, instead of being a *Mistake*, all this is true from the *Beginning* to the *End*.

CHAP. II.

CONTENTS, Mr. WESLEY begins nibbling at my Definition; is guilty of scandalous Misquotations one after another, by which means he gets quite bewildered in his own Mistakes: drops the name of Methodist, that they may have no Namesakes; takes it up again, distinguishing the Sect into Originals and Non-originals; excepts against the Non-originals, as their Testimony bears against him, yet when he comes at length to the main Question about their Principles, witnesses the same Thing against himself. Talks wild of the Monthly Reviewers, Connecting them with one Roger Balls a Methodist, complains of my Severity, though guilty of so much Dishonesty in misciting my Works, and then retires in Confusion to appear no more.

C H A P. II.

1. **I** proceed to your Definition of them : *By the Methodists was then and is now understood, a Set of Enthusiasts who pretending to be Members of the Church of England, either offend against the Order and Discipline of the Church, or pervert its Doctrines relating to Faith and Works and the Terms of Salvation.*

Another grievous Mistake. For whatever is now, by the Methodists then was not understood, any Set of Enthusiasts, or not Enthusiasts, offending against the Order and Discipline of the Church. They were tenacious of it to the last degree, in every the least Jot and Tittle. Neither were they then understood as pervert its Doctrines, relating to Faith and Works, and the Terms of Salvation. For they thought and talk'd of all these just as you do now, 'till some of them after their Return from Georgia were perverted into different Sentiments, by reading the Book of Homilies. Their Perversion therefore (if such it be) is to be dated from this Time. Consequently, your Definition by no Means agrees with the Persons defined.

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

In this Chapter you take a most unwarrantable Liberty, in altering and curtailing my *Definition* of a *Methodist*, and introducing it as mine in that imperfect Form. This you had no Right to do, as it was to stand or fall by its own Meaning ; and that remaining entire, and not else, you were at Liberty to dispute, if you could, what I had established therein as the *Marks and Characters*, that denote a *Methodist*. This you attempt indeed, but how insignificant your Objections are, you will soon discern ; for if you were so *tenacious to a Title* at your first setting out of the *Order and Discipline* of the *Church of England*, why did any of you so long ago

2. However, *As a Shibboleth to distinguish them at present, when they pretend to conceal themselves, throw out this or such like Proposition, "Good Works, are necessary to Salvation."* You might have spared yourself the Labour of proving this? For who is there that denies it; Not I: Not any in Connexion with me: So that this *Shibboleth* is just good for nothing.

And yet we firmly believe, That a Man is justified by Faith, without the Works of the Law: That to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the Ungodly, his Faith, without any Good Work proceeding, is counted to him for Righteousness. We believe (to express it a little more largely) that we are accounted Righteous before God. only for the Merit of *Christ*: by Faith, and not for our own Works or Deservings. Good Works follow after Justification, springing out of true, living Faith. so that by them living Faith may be as evidently known, as a Tree discerned by the Fruit. And hence it follows, that as the Body without the Soul is dead, so *that* Faith which is without Works is dead also. This therefore properly speaking is not Faith; as a dead Man is not properly a Man

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

ago begin to distinguish yourselves by a riotous Preaching in the Fields, when it is absolutely forbidden by the Laws of the Land? As to your Concession concerning the powerful Change that was wrought in *some of you*, by reading the *Homilies*, after your Return from *Georgia*, I want it not in this Argument, having Proof enough without it, and for its Merit in another View, you have had my Sentiments already in the Notes upon your *first* Letter, pag. 39 of my *Edition*, to which I refer the Reader, that I may not swell this PAMPHLET *beyond all Size*, by needless Repetitions.

Verse 2nd. Notwithstanding your Remarks upon my *Shibboleth* (Verse 2.) I fancy, it will answer the Purpose very well, for I find, that you do not care to *pronounce* it. You say indeed, that I might have spared myself the Trouble

of proving this PROPOSITION, "*that good Works are absolutely necessary to Salvation*" "For who is there denies it? not *You*." And yet you endeavour to *contradict* it in the next Paragraph. For otherwise, you are guilty of idle knavish *Sophistry*, by introducing the Sentence with, *and yet*; that is, by a Phrase of *Opposition*, where you pretend to mean no Opposition, to which Opposition notwithstanding, what immediately follows, in all Appearance corresponds. For who is there amongst us now, that thinks *Christians* are to observe the *Ceremonies* of the *Jewish Law*? And therefore, if by the *Works of the Law*, you mean, that a Man is justified *without* the Works of the *Law of JESUS CHRIST*; you affirm, and deny in the same Breath; it being a direct *Contradiction* to the *Proposition*, which just before, you said, I might *have spared myself the Trouble of proving*, as it is likewise a *Contradiction* to our Saviour's own Declaration, *that he will reward "every Man according to his Works;"* the very Thing I charged upon the *Methodists* as *abominable*, which you have all along on your own Part pretended to deny, and yet appear to hold it at the last. Sir, are you such a Stranger to your own Opinions, as not to know what *you hold*? or what *you do not hold*? In this disordered and bewildered State, are you fit for *Disputation*?

Again, If in the next Sentence by "*him, that worketh not,*" you do not mean the *Neglect of actual Obedience*, and do not think, that *without* such *Obedience*, *Abraham* was accounted *Righteous*

teous, then it is very idle to *oppose* this *Text* to my *Doctrine*, if it contain in it no Opposition: But if on the Contrary, you so understand the Words *worketh not*, as to infer from thence that *Abraham* obtained Salvation without any *Works*, then you are *again* guilty of the Charge I brought against the other *Methodists*; and though but the Minute before, you affected, to disown it, are now *again*, if doing any Thing, actually preaching *Salvation* without *Obedience*. And indeed, unless it were to countenance such an Opinion, why should you say in the very next Sentence, "We believe (to express it a " little *more largely*) that we are accounted " *Righteous* before God, only for the Merit of Jesus Christ," without adding, that though this be the *sole Attonement* for our Imperfections, yet, that we *cannot be saved* without *Obedience*: For otherwise, Sir, the Word *Only*, taken as you call it, *more largely*, and in its *full Extent*, would exclude from our *Righteousness* all *Morality*, and all *Obedience*, which is once again the *Doctrine* I charge upon the *Methodists*; and at the same Time that it is, as I contend, a *Perversion* of the *Doctrine* of the Church of ENGLAND. For I have already explained, the Force of this Expression as it is used in the Church of *England*, in a Note upon the Preface to my *Sermon*,* and shewn that in this Sense, and upon the like Occasions, the word *Only* does not signify ex-

* *Sermon* before the University of OXFORD, Preface, pag. vii. new Edition.

clusively but *conclusively*, meaning often *primarily* or *chiefly*, being put to denote *Pre-eminence*, as it is to be understood in the *Communion-Service*.

"Thou *only* O Christ with the Holy Ghost, "are most high," &c. For if the word *Only* were here to be taken *strictly* and *exclusively*, it would signify "thou *Only* O Christ, *without* "the Holy Ghost, art most High in the Glory "of God the Father."

Further, the word *Justification*, as you have used it *here*, cannot mean *final justification*, (the Nature of which I have explained in the *Prolegomena*;) but only *Conversion*. If it means the former, you relapse again deeply into the same Error with the other *Methodists*, from which within the Compass of two or three Sentences you pretended so vehemently to demand an *Ab-solution*. For if a Man were to be *finally justified* before he grew virtuous, *good Works* would be utterly excluded from any Way effecting his *Justification*. Because if they only follow after it, they could not be the conditional Cause of effecting it, which excludes Morality from any Share or Operation in the Business of Salvation: And if by *Justification* you mean only the *initial justification*, or *Conversion*, then the Word has here a very *delusive* and dangerous Tendency amongst common People, as it is so Connected, unless you had added withal the proper *Distinctions* and *Explications*.

I refer the Reader therefore to the *MAXIMS* and *EXPLICATIONS* in my *Prolegomena*, particularly *Maxim* the 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12 and *Explication* the 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, &c. And

3. You add, *The original Methodists affect to call themselves Methodists of the Church of England: By which they plainly inform us, there are others of their Body, who do not profess to belong to it. Whence we may infer, the Methodists who take our Name, do yet by acknowledging them, as Namesakes and Brethren, give themselves the Lie, when they say they are of our Communion! Our Name! Our Communion! Apage cum istâ tuâ magnificentiâ!* How came it, I pray, to be *your Name*, any more than Mr. Venn's? But waving this: Here is another Train of Mistakes. For 1. We do not call ourselves *Methodists* at all. 2 That we call ourselves *Members of the Church of England* is certain. Such we ever were, and such we are at this Day. 3 Yet we do not *by this plainly inform* you, that there are others of our Body, who do not belong to it. By what Rule of Logic do you infer this Conclusion from those Premises. 4 You have another Inference full as good. Hence one may infer, *That by acknowledging Them, as Namesakes and Brethren, they give themselves the Lie, when they say they are of our Communion.* As we do not take the Name of *Methodists* at all, so we do not acknowledge any *Namesakes* in this. But we acknowledge as *Brethren* all Dissenters (whether they are called *Methodist* or not) who labour to have a Conscience void of Offence, towards God and towards Man. What lies upon you to prove is this: Whoever acknowledges any Dissenters as Brethren, does hereby give himself the Lie, when he says he is a *Member of the Church of England.*

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

And now what are we to think of all these *Sayings*, and *Unsayings*, this incoherent Series of jarring Propositions so strangely put together? Have not I detected you at your *old Trick* of *entangling the Doctrines* of the Church of England, with *Absurdities* and *Contradictions*? Can you be a Friend to that Church, who affect thus to shew your Dexterity in forming Difficulties, from some of it's improper and ill-chosen Phrases, which through Time perhaps have lost or chang'd their *Meaning*, and thus by your *Cobweb-Sophistry* to expose it to the Derision of its Enemies?

If

If this be your Conduct with Respect to the Church, Sir, it is no Wonder that the next *Verse* (3) affords a notable Specimen of your Iniquitous Dealings, with Respect to me. For your *Conviction*, I shall first produce the *Passage*, which you have so disfigured by a false Quotation, as entirely to alter the Meaning. My Words are these * “ This may be the Way “ then to discover the ORIGINAL *Methodists*, “ who it seems for *Distinction's* Sake affect to “ call themselves *Methodists* of the Church of “ *England*.

“ By which however they plainly inform us, “ that there are others of their *Body*, who do “ not profess to belong to our *Communion*: And “ therefore it is just to infer that the *Methodists* “ who take our Name, do notwithstanding “ disavow *something*, which these disavow; “ and embrace *something*, which they embrace; “ and therefore by Acknowledging them as “ *Namesakes* and *Brethren*, give themselves the “ Lie, (which they are not ashamed to do) “ when they say, that they are entirely with us, “ and of *no other Communion*.”

These are my Words, Sir, this Paragraph is mine, and I do not see that you could find any thing to contradict in this: Though after the Misinterpretation you have made in misciting it, what a Parcel of Nonsense is here of your own coining, which you would impudently ascribe to me? You ask me ignorantly enough as well

* Page viii. of the Preface to my *Sermon* at OXFORD, the Third Edition.

as well as dishonestly by what Rule of Logick, I infer this Conclusion from these Premisses? I answer by none in the World. For none but a Man that was an entire Stranger to Reason, could ever have made it, let me bring you to a Sense of Shame if I can, if you are not past Feeling. Are these *my Premisses*? Sir, or are those my Words at the End of the other Conclusion? am I to follow you in your Blunders, and to be directed by a Man, who is so bewildered, that he knows not what he is about? Let me ask you, Sir, how you came to be so base? As to put in these Words, “*of our Communion*” when my Words were “*of no other Communion.*” Had you made such an *Erasement*, and Alteration in Papers, conveying property, your *Life* might have been in Danger. Do you think that any Person, who, has any Regard for his Reputation, will have any farther Dealings in *Controversy* with one, that can be guilty of such *foul Play* as this? To such Reproach, Sir, is your Conduct liable when examined by the Rules of *Common Honesty*: And if there be this Defect of *common Honesty*? What are we to think of your RELIGION, your *Christian Religion*? Can we believe, that when capable of this Falshood you were under the Influence of that? No, SIR, that would have deterred you from such an Attempt. And as a *Christian* you would have *reasoned* thus; “I am going to do by Dr. Free, as I would, by no Means, be done by: I am going to alter his Words, and misrepresent his Meaning in Print; which is misrepresenting him, as far

" as I can to *all the World*; at least this Pamph-
 " let of mine will go into the Hands of *Hun-*
 " *dreds* of the deluded *Methodists*, whose Preju-
 " dices will never let them peruse any *Reply*,
 " which Dr. *Free* may publish in his *Defence*;
 " and so I shall fix all these *poor People* at least
 " in a wrong *Notion* of his *Meaning* and *Under-*
 " *standing*."—A pretty *Soliloquy*!—And could
 you as a *Christian* do all this?—No, Sir! The
Christian Religion would not permit you. And
 therefore from *henceforth* you *oblige* me to con-
 sider you as an *Heathen Man*, and a *Publican*,
 how much soever you may complain of my
Severity. I cannot leave this remarkable Para-
 graph without making a distinct Remark upon
 a very singular Passage, to wit;—" That you do
 " not call yourselves *Methodists* at all."—Why
 did you then, write the *Character* of a *Method-*
ist? " You say that it is certain you call your-
 " selves *Members* of the *Church* of *ENGLAND*!"
 —Thus much by my *Definition* of a *METHO-*
DIST you find I know.—" Such, you ever
 " were, and such you are at this Day."—But
 how can this be, Sir, when your *Meeting* at the
Foundery, if *licensed* at all, must be licensed as
 a *DISSENTING Meeting*, of some *Denomination*
 or other? And again,—when the *People* you
 often employ to *preach* there, and elsewhere,
 have never had *Episcopal Ordination* and conse-
 quently oppose the 23. *Article* of the *Church* of
England, which proves, that you are not of the
Church of *England*:—And that you are still
Method-

4. However you allow. there may be Place for Repentance For if any of the Founders of this Sect, renounce the Opinions they once were charged with, they may be permitted to lay aside the Name. But what are the Opinions which you require us to renounce? What are, according to you, the Principles of the Methodists?

You say in general, *They are contradictory to the Gospel, contradictory to the Church of England, full of Blasphemy and Impiety, and ending in downright Atheism:*

1. For 1. *They expound the Scripture in such a Manner, as to make it contradict itself:*

2, With Blasphemy, Impiety and Diabolical Phrenzy, they contradict our Saviour, by denying that he will judge Men, according to their Works.

3. By denying this they destroy the essential Attributes of GOD, and ruin his Character as Judge of the World.

In support of the First Charge, you say, *It is notorious, and few Men of Common Sense attempt to prove what is notorious, 'till they meet with People of such notortous Impudence as to deny it.*

I must really deny it. Why then you will prove it, by Mr. Mason's own Words. Hold, Sir: Mr. Mason's Words prove nothing. For we are now speaking of ORIGINAL Methodists. But he is not one of them: Nor is he in Connexion with them; neither with Mr. Whitfield nor me. So that what Mr. Mason speaks, be it right or wrong, is nothing to the present purpose. Therefore unless you can find some better Proof, this whole Charge falls to the Ground.

Well, here it is. Roger Balls—Pray, who is Roger Balls? No more a Methodist than he is a Turk. I know not one good Thing he ever said or did, beside the telling all Men, I am no Methodist, which he generally does in the first Sentence he speaks, when he can find any to hear him. He is therefore one of your own Allies. And a Champion worthy of his Cause!

If then you have no more than this to advance in support of your First Charge, you have alledged what you are not able to prove. And the more heavy that Allegation is, the more unkind, the more unjust, the more unchristian, the more inhuman it is to bring it without Proof.

5. In support of the Second Charge, you say, *Our Saviour declares our Works to be the Object of his Judgment. But the Methodist, for the Perdition of the Souls of his Followers, says our Works are of no Consideration at all.*

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

Methodists, and within the Terms of my Definition, shall be proved to every Body's Satisfaction, except your own.

Who says so? Mr. *Whitfield*? Or my Brother? Or I? We say the direct contrary. But one of my anonymous Correspondents says so. Who is he? How do you know he is a *Methodist*? For ought appears, he may be another of your Allies, a Brother to *Roger Balls*.

Three or Threescore anonymous Correspondents, cannot yield one grain of Proof, any more than an Hundred anonymous Remarks on *Theron* and *Aspasio*. Before these can prove what the *Methodists* hold, you must prove, that these are *Methodists*: Either, that they are ORIGINAL *Methodists*, or in Connexion with them.

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

Verse 4. and 5. Suppose we set about it now? Indeed I have not your *Orders* or *Direction* for it, just yet; but to be plain; as I am not quite satisfied with your Manner of laying out a Subject, I am not always bound to follow it; nor do I choose it here: and therefore I attack a distant Passage first, and tell you, that I think, I have taken a right Step, by *proving*, first what *Opinions* the accused Parties hold in order to *prove* that they are *Methodists*. You shall see in the Course of the Dispute whether I am mistaken or not. It may be necessary first to *premise*, that in this Chapter you raise a Difficulty about the *promiscuous* Use of the Word *Methodist*, distinguishing them, for the geater *Exactness*, into *Originals* and *Non-originals*. In the first Class you put *yourself*, your *Brother*, and Mr. *Whitfield*, as People of the *same Opinion*, — In the other then, as you only make an Exception for *yourself* and Co. we are at Liberty, I suppose, to rank all the rest; such as Mr. *Hervey*, Mr. *Romaine*, Mr. *Venn*, Mr. *Elliot*, Mr. *Jones*, *Roger Balls*, whose Lay-Profession, I know not; and the *Clock-maker* Mr. *Mason*.
&c.

&c. Should we not add another *Layman* supposed to be a *N—L—*, who in his Answer to Dr. FREE discovered (a Thing more surprizing than the *Longitude*) the *Medium* between *Truth* and *Falshood*, and tells us * that some † *Accounts* of Things (though containing many Propositions) “ may be received as neither “ *true* nor *false*, this must be a *Conjurer* to be sure ; shall I add him to the rest?

Well you tell me, that “ *before these can* “ *prove what the METHODISTS hold; I must prove,* “ *that these are METHODISTS,*” &c. that is I suppose you mean, that I cannot from their Doctrines prove, what the *Methodists* hold, till I have first proved these People to be *Methodists*—An *Hysteron-Proteron* may be a *Figure* in *Rhetorick*, but it makes a strange *Figure* in *LOGICK*, to see the *Conclusion* before the *Premisses*. By your Leave I must ask the AUDIENCE, before whom you say, you are making your Defence, (that is, the ARCH-BISHOP, the UNIVERSITY, the NATION) whether this be a *Scholar-like* Arrangement of the *Propositions*, which you require me here to prove. For I think, that I ought *first* to shew, that the Doctrines, which these People hold, are the Doctrines of the *Methodists*, and then the *Proposition*, which you would have me prove *first*, must be *last* in SENSE and REASON and follow the other as a *Consequence* : For the Argument will stand thus, “ they hold *such Opinions* &c.”

* *Layman's Answer* to Dr. Free. Pag. 16.

† Letter from the *Mansions* above.

and therefore *they* are *Methodists*. For suppose I was to prove a Man to be a PAPIST. Must I not first shew, that he holds the *Opinions* of a PAPIST? Or can I *any way* shew, that he is a PAPIST, *without* his holding the *Opinions* of a Papist? I think not.—My LORD ARCHBISHOP, *Gentlemen* of the UNIVERSITY, and YE *Men* of *common Sense* throughout the NATION—I appeal—(since he will have it so) to you all to know, whether Mr. *Wesley* has not put a very *injudicious* Task upon me? And whether I may not be permitted to go on in *my own Way*, since he appears so incapable of directing me? Now then, having, as I suppose, obtained this Permission: Remember your Names ORIGINALS, and NON-ORIGINALS, as you stood before; and my *Definition* shall hold the Place of an *Indictment*.—But is this my Definition Sir? — No! — My *Definition* stood thus.—

“ A Set of *Enthusiasts*, who under the *Pretence* of being true Members of the Church of *England*, either prevert its DOCTRINES relating to *Faith* and *Works*, and the *Terms* of Salvation, so as to make them *repugnant* to the *Holy Scriptures*; or else offend against the ORDER and DISCIPLINE of the Church, or further, even attack the *Principles* of *natural* Religion, and still under the *Pretence* of being Members of the Church of *England*, or at least Christians.”

And now, Sir, pardon me if by the *Practices*, in which you still persist, and by the *Opinions*

pinions, you have held or hold, I prove you to be a *Methodist*: and that I comprehend in this *Definition, Discription or Indictment*, the CHARACTER of you the great ORIGINAL, the other ORIGINALS, the NON-ORIGINALS and afterwards of the *Secundarians, Subalterns* and all the rest: For I believe, that every Person will find his Place herein, who is, or has been esteemed or called either *Methodistical* or *Methodist*.

But *First*, against you *Gentlemen*, who are ORIGINALS; suppose I call in the EVIDENCE of the *Right Reverend* the Lord BISHOP of *Exeter*, the reputed *Author* of a † Book entitled the *Enthusiasm* of the *Methodists* and *PAPISTS* compared. What says his Lordship of the *Revd. Mr. John Wesley*, *Mr. Whitfield* and the rest? Why he proves you to be *Enthusiasts*, from your own JOURNALS and Accounts of God's DEALINGS: Among other Passages, to the same Purpose; suppose we consider these. *Mr. Whitfield* says, *first Dealing* Pag. 16. "God filled me with such *unspeakable Raptures*, particularly in *St. John's Church*. that I was carried out beyond myself." Again *Mr. Wesley* says, 3 *Journal* Pag. 19 "My Soul was got up into the *Holy Mount*, I had no Thoughts of coming down again into the Body."

By these Passages then, it appears that you are both *Enthusiasts*; which must make good

† Pag. 59. Part. 1.

the FIRST Article in my Definition: I shall now make it appear likewise, that you are *Enthusiasts perverting the Doctrines, and offending against the Discipline of the Church of ENGLAND &c.* For the Church of ENGLAND does not allow of any *irregular and unqualified Teachers*; it does not allow it's *Pastors* to preach in *irregular Places*; or to call themselves *Dissenters*: This is offending against its DISCIPLINE: and for offences against it's DOCTRINE, I reckon them to be such *Opinions* as these. * Mr. *Whitfield* says, " it is a dreadful mistake to deny the " Doctrine of *Assurances*; he knows Numbers " whose Salvation is written in their Hearts as " with a *Sun-Beam*." — 8 Journal, Page 17. Mr. *Wesley* says, " *Justification* the same as " Regeneration and having a living Faith, — " this always in a *Moment* — *Faith* and being " born of God — an *instantaneous Work*, as " *Lightening*. — My being born of God was " an *instantaneous Act*, enabling me from that " Moment to be more than *Conqueror* over those " Corruptions, which before I was always a " Slave to," — Journal 2. And again Journal 3 " At that Hour, one who had long continued in Sin from a *Despair* of finding Mercy received a full clear Sense of his pardoning Love, and Power to Sin no more." Now all this is directly opposite to the 16 Article of the Church of ENGLAND, which supposes in the best of Men a *Possibility* of Sinning and

* Bp. of Exeter's Book Part 2. P. 32. 33. 34.

and that they may after such their Failings be restored.

But beside the *Opposition* of this Doctrine to that particular *Article* of our Church: I observe by these Accounts of an *instantaneous* living Faith, and of being *irresistibly born of God*, that the Man is represented as no longer a *Rational* Being, or *moral* Agent. For all these *Operations* are described as entirely the Acts of God. The Man then in these Cases is altogether *passive* and not capable of *any* Works. And therefore if this be the *Wesleyan*, or *Methodist* kind of *Faith*, it is a kind of Faith, from which the Man's own ACTIONS are utterly *excluded*: (very similar to Mr. HERVEY's Doctrine, as you will see hereafter) For being *more than Conquerers*, not by the *Assistance*, but by the entire *Force* and *Agency* of another POWER, he has no longer Occasion to *work out his Salvation with Fear and Trembling*. So that Text of Scripture is superseded, as well as all *other Scripture*, which is a *Rule of CONDUCT*; and with it another fundamental Doctrine of the *Church of ENGLAND*, which supposes a Man's good Actions to be his, by saying, that *they are pleasing in God's Sight*. For if the Actions were God's Actions it would be just as much Sense as saying, that *God was pleased with God*, or that he diverted himself with his Ingenuity in moving our Limbs, and determining our weak *mechanick* Powers to every particular Action. And thus God is represented as the Master of the SHEW, and we as the PUPPETS that Squeak
H and

and *Dance*, but at his Direction: From such frightful *Absurdities* in a NATIONAL RELIGION! Good Lord deliver us.

But beside this DOCTRINE of a STATE of *unfinning* and *unalterable* PERFECTION in this Life; which is set forth as the *sudden* and *irresistible* Gift of God, and which represents Man as a *Mackine*, so totally *possessed* and *actuated* by Divine Power as to leave no Room for human FRAILTY, or human ENDEAVOURS: You have been accused of advancing another *Doctrine* as *destructive* of *Morality*, even that, which I charged upon the *Methodists* from the first, and which all the World is now convinced they hold. "The Doctrine of *Salvation* by *Faith alone* as it is understood to *exclude the Necessity of good Works*." Even in this Pamphlet where I had said "they were *absolutely* necessary to Salvation," in repeating my Words, you drop the Word *absolutely*; and in the next Paragraph, so connect some *Extracts* from the *Articles* as considering the double Meaning of the Word *Justification* must according to *vulgar Apprehension* look most *favourable* to such an Opinion: 'Tis true you professed to deny it *before*; nay you have *written against* it, as I am informed, therefore this veering about again looks very inconsistent. That you were once inclined to such an Opinion, I think, Sir, is pretty evident. Mr. C. Grange, if you remember, testifies in the 34 Page of my NOTES upon your first LETTER, that he heard
one

one of the *Lay-brothers*, whom you had *set up aloft* to harangue in your *Conventicle* at the *FOUNDERY*, inculcating the same; and tells us the *HYMN*, which was Sung upon the Occasion.

*Believe and all your Sins forgiven,
Only believe and yours is Heaven.*

He says that other of your *HYMNS* have the same Tendency, and mentions particularly the 44. *Look and be sav'd by Faith alone.*

This Opinion then, if you have not renounced it, will bear hard against you, and if you have even given it up; yet considering the *Evidence* we have just gathered from the *LORD BISHOP of Exeter's* display of your *Journals*, which contain your *ENTHUSIASTICK Flights and Fancies*; and your strange Notions of *FAITH*, as though in some Subjects attended with such a *PERFECTION*, as implies an Annihilation of *human AGENCY*: You must forgive me, if I find you guilty of the *Indictment*, and by the *Terms* of my *DEFINITION*, pronounce You, and all the *ORIGINALS*, which you describe to be in the *same way of thinking*, to be *Metho-dists*. For it appears that You are. —

“ A Set of *Enthusiasts*, who under the *Pre-tence* of being true Members of the Church
“ of *England*, either prevert its *DOCTRINES*
“ relating to *Faith* and *Works*, and the *Terms*
“ of Salvation, so as to make them *repugnant*
“ to the *Holy Scriptures*: or else offend against
“ the *ORDER* and *DISCIPLINE* of the Church,
“ or

“ or farther, even attack the *Principles* of natural Religion, and still under the *Pretense* of being Members of the Church of England, or at least Christians.”

And having affirmed this of You and your declared ASSOCIATES, from the Knowledge you have given us in *Writing* of your *Belief* and *Practice*; let me now examine how far this APPELLATION may suit the REST: I shall allow them the *Title*, as by their *Doctrines*, they may appear to merit it; just in the same Manner, as I gave it you. Mr. *Hervey*, then (whom as I have heard, you called the FATHER of *Methodism* in your *Canonization* Sermon) whether that be true I cannot tell; but Mr. *Hervey* (for whom the *Gazetteer* of Jan. 10. 1759, tells us the Woman at *Abergavenny*, though unknown to him went into Mourning at his Death: If she had understood his Doctrine she might have mourned for that — This Mr. *Hervey*) though our SAVIOUR had declared, *Matth. xvi. 27.* To Him, to Me, and every Man alive, that *he will reward every Man according to his Works*, had the Presumption to *new-model* the *Terms* of the GOSPEL and to reply. † “ We are I grant justified by WORKS — but not our own.” If I ask him, *Whose then?* he answers, “ *The Works of Christ,*” so that the Man is required by his Scheme in *Opposition* to our LORD's, to do just *nothing* for himself. And therefore here is no more room for *Morality* in this *System* than there was in YOUR State of *unfanning* PERFECTION.

FECTION. The same § Mr. *Hervy* adds in another Passage (where he introduces one of his Sort of *Christians* reasoning thus.)—" 'Tis true, " I cannot fullfill the Conditions, and 'tis equally true, that this is not *required at my Hands* — JESUS CHRIST has performed all " that was *Conditionary*." — What is become then of our LORDS *Declaration* and all his *Injunctions*? Why this *new Christian* Religion hath set the *old one* quite aside: And makes no manner of Account of any *human* Actions. For that there is not in the Estimation of the *divine* Being any Distinction between VICE and VIRTUE.—To this Purpose, hear the *Passages* before produced from the *anonymous* Remarker on *Theron* and *Aspasio*, he may be one of your own People for ought I know; but who he is, or what his Name may be, does not concern the *Argument*, provided that he has made his Quotations *fair* and *right*, so as to speak the *Meaning* of the Author; that the World may judge of this; the Passages are these, that follow.

" He who attempts to do any Thing easy
" or difficult, under the Notion of an Act of
" believing, or any other Act, in Order to his
" Acceptance with God, only heaps up more
" *Wrath* against himself."—And again,

" The whole New Testament speaks aloud,
" that as to the Matter of Acceptance with

“ God, there is no Difference between one
 “ Man and another:— No Difference betwixt
 “ the most accomplished *Gentleman*, and the
 “ most infamous *Scoundrel*:— No Difference
 “ betwixt the most virtuous *Lady*, and the
 “ vilest Prostitute: — No Difference betwixt
 “ the most Reverend Judge, and the most o-
 “ dious Criminal standing convicted before
 “ him, and receiving the just Sentence of
 “ Death at his Mouth:—In a Word, no Dif-
 “ ference betwixt the most fervent Devotee,
 “ and the greatest Ringleader in Profaneness
 “ and Excess.”

In another Place he says,—“ both *Grace* and
 “ *Truth* stand in direct Opposition to Works,
 “ *all Works* whatever, whether they be *Works*
 “ of the *Law*, or *Works of the Gospel*, done in
 “ a State of Nature, or *under the Influence of*
 “ *Grace*.—vol. 1. P. 273.”

Thus much for *Theron* and *Aspasio*, and the
 Doctrines of the weak and crazy Mr. *Hervey*,
 one of the reputed FATHERS of *Methodism*,
 whose laboured *Antichristian* Theology, and
religious Blasphemy have been so zealously
 propagated through the Land, and revered as
 the Bible, by the *Methodists*. Now for the
 Opinions of Mr. *Romaine*, ; because you are so
 apt to ask me, “ *Who says so? Who is he, how*
 “ *do you know he is a Methodist?---* I must beg
 leave to refresh your Memory, by referring
 you to a little Treatise, said to be your own,
 entitled a Letter to a Gentleman at *Bristol*,
 which contains Remarks upon a Pamphlet
 ascribed

ascribed to Mr. Romaine. Let us hear some of your *Conversation*.

Mr. Romaine. But a Man is not justified by "Works, but by the Faith of Christ. This excludes all Qualifications.

Mr. Wesley. Surely it does not exclude the Qualification of Faith, &c.

Mr. Romaine. But "our Church excludes Repentance and Faith from *deserving* any Part of our Justification. Why then do you insist upon them as *Qualifications requisite* to our Justification."

Mr. Wesley. Because *Christ* and his Apostles do so. Yet we all agree, they do not *deserve* any Part of our Justification. They are no Part of the *meritorious Cause*; but they are the Conditions of it. This and no other is "the Doctrine of Scripture, and of the Church of England!" Both the Scripture and "our Church allow, yea insist on these *Qualifications or Conditions*."

Mr. Romaine. "But if Repentance and Faith would not be valid and acceptable without the Righteousness of *Christ*, then they cannot be necessary Qualifications for our Justification."

Mr. Wesley. I cannot allow the Consequence. They are not acceptable without the Righteousness or Merits of *Christ*. And yet He Himself has made them necessary Qualifications thro' his Merits.

But the grand Objection of this Gentleman lies against the Dr's. next Paragraph; the Sum
of

of which is: "The Merits of *Christ* were
 "never intended to supersede the Necessity
 "of Repentance and Obedience" (I would say,
 Repentance and Faith) "but to make them
 "acceptable in the Sight of God, and to *pur-*
 "*chase* for them" (I would add *that obey Him*)
 "a Reward of immortal Happiness."

I am not afraid to undertake the Defence of
 this Paragraph, with this small Variation,
 against Mr. *Chapman*, Mr. *Nyberg*, Count *Zin-*
zendorf, or any other Person whatever. Pro-
 vided only that he will set his Name to his
 Work: For I do not love fighting in the Dark.

And I (as well as Dr. *T.* affirm, That "to
 "say more than this concerning *Christ's* im-
 "puted Merits," to say more than, that "they
 "have purchased for us Grace to repent and
 "believe, Acceptance upon our believing,
 "Power to obey, and eternal Salvation to
 "them that do obey Him:" To say more than
 this "is blasphemous *Antinomianism*," such as
 "Mr. *Calvin* would have abhorred, and does
 "open a Door to all Manner of Sin and Wick-
 edness"

"I must likewise affirm, That to talk of *imputed*
Righteousness in the Manner many do at this
 Day, is making the imaginary Transfer of *Christ's*
Righteousness serve as a Cover for the *Unrighteous-*
ness of Mankind. Does not Mr. *Ch-p-n* do this
 at *Bristol*? Does not Mr. *M--rd--n*, at *London*?
 Let them shudder then, let their Blood run cold,
 who do it: Not theirs, who tell them that
 they do so." Thus far Mr. *Wesley* against Mr. *R.*

Eu!

Eu! Noster laudo, in melius quantum mutatus ab illo, why could not you write as well when you wrote to me? You here condemn Mr. Romaine's Opinions, as contrary to Reason and Scripture; and the Articles of the Church of England. But did not you know that these Men were *Methodists*? *Ridiculum, non enim cogitaras*. They may not be *Wesleyans* indeed, as *Wesley* shews himself in this Letter to a Gentleman; but notwithstanding that, they are all *Methodists to a Man*; if you are not already sensible of it, you must see it presently, *idem hoc tute melius quanto invenisses Thraso?*

For by the Way, will not this Remark, which you have made upon the *new* Terms and Phrases, used by Mr. Romaine, bear a little hard upon your Friend Mr. Venn? Has not he printed a Sermon under the Title of *Imputed Righteousness, and Obedience not to be separated?* You observe, that there are no such Terms in the Article, as, *ONLY* through Christ's *imputed Righteousness*: We remark also, that such Terms do not accord with the Church Liturgy. For I do not remember, that it any where uses this Language of IMPUTATION. It calls the Death of our Lord indeed, "a full perfect and sufficient Sacrifice Oblation and Satisfaction" for the Sins of the whole World" which enables him to *intercede*, and nominate such as fulfill his Conditions; or, are in their several Capacities, the proper Objects of REDEMPTION. But here is not a Word of *Imputation*. You and Mr. Venn, may possibly settle that Point be-

tween you, but here is another *Imputation-Man*, who *cancels* all *Obligation* to Obedience. What shall we do with him?

Mr. Elliot, late Chaplain to the *Hospital* at *Hyde-Park-Corner*, in a Sermon, entitled *Encouragement for Sinners*, &c. After giving us his Account of *imputed* Righteousness, pag. 10. says, "Lastly it is concluded, that we are *justified by Faith only*, whereby ALL Works of every Kind, are *shut out*, as being wholly *unnecessary* and *useless* in this great Matter, even a Sinner's Justification before God." And it is plain, that he means *final* Justification by what follows. *James* ii. Ch. and 23. v. is alledged by this Man and others, as the *Ground* or *Foundation* for this DOCTRINE of *imputed* Righteousness, *Abraham believed God*, and it was *imputed to him for Righteousness*. But if these poor People could read their *Testament* in the original GREEK, (and till they can, they are not fit to be Teachers) they would see that there is no such Word as *imputed* there, the GREEK is ἐλογίσθη *computed, considered, accounted, reckoned*, and never bore any other Signification, in that Language: that it should here be rendered by *imputed*, is wholly owing to the *Ignorance*, or *Baseness* of some TRANSLATORS. For the genuine Interpretation of the Passage is, ABRAHAM put his Confidence in God, and for this he was accounted a just, or good Man, and was called the Friend of God. But I only offer this by Way, as one INSTANCE of a thousand, that might be produced to shew how the Doctrines of these People are founded entirely

tirely in *Ignorance* and *Deception*, and have no Place in the true GOOSPEL. This Man hath lately published a *Vindication* of the same Sermon, under the Tittle of SIN DESTROYED, &c. By which I suppose we are to understand, that there is now no such Thing as SIN, I have not seen this Pamphlet myself, for it is by no means pleasing to rake in such Filth.

But by the Account of it in the Monthly Review for *October*, it appears to be full of the same shocking Principles, which the Author impudently attributes to the Articles of the Church of *England*: And to shew how well this tallies with the Opinions of your acknowledged Associate, and Fellow-methodist Mr. *Whitfield*, I have heard, that this Man has been prayed for, at his Tabernacle as a BROTHER under Persecution.

The next upon the List, I think is *Roger Balls*, but you disclaim all *Acquaintance* with him, and make him an *Ally* of my own, is not this extremely Jocular? For I cannot say, that I ever heard of *Roger*, or knew there was such a Being in the World, till a good Woman, who sent me your Affize Sermon, accompanied it with a Piece of his wonderful Composition. I expressed my Concern to see you in such Company: But yet I think we must set him down for a *methodistical* Fellow, if not a *Methodist*. I cannot say indeed whether he calls himself of the Church of ENGLAND: But he professes to be a Minister of the GOSPEL, and under that Profession discards the old JESUS CHRIST

CHRIST, that was born in *Bethlehem*, and all his Injunctions and Commands, as of no worth at all, if compared to a certain *Jesus*, which he carries about him, a *Christus Engastrimuthus, et Gastrimargus*, which "he feels within him stirring to be born" And upon his bringing him forth, he calls out lustily here's a "Christ indeed, that will do you all some good" -- O brave Roger! But if you think he has been guilty of a Misdemeanor, his *Evidence* shall be set aside, as we can spare him; to make Room for the next. I hope you will admit of HIM, it is *W. M.* (that is *William Mason*) CLOCKMAKER, of *Rotherhithe Wall*. He is very bold and saith, that he the said *William Mason*, "is a Methodist of the Church of England, &c. And he concludes (for himself and Brethren) that a Man is justified, (his Sins pardoned, his Person accepted to God's Love and Favour, and his Title to Glory evidenced to him) by FAITH, without the *Deeds* of the Law, "either natural, ceremonial, † or moral," &c. But you cry *Hold!* "Mr. Mason's Words prove nothing," why so? Is not Mr. Mason a Man of *Veracity*? I think this is cruel Treatment, to baulk the Gentleman so, and make him blush before such an *Audience*. You reply, that you are speaking of the original *Methodists*, and "he is not one of them." This *Distinction* is now of no Service, he says he is a *Methodist* of the

* p. 13. Mystery of Christ crucified.

† Remarks &c. in a Letter to Dr. FREE, p. 18.

16. Will you say, "If these were not *Methodists* themselves, they would not defend the *Methodists*?" I deny the Consequence: Men may be far from being *Methodists*, and yet willing to do the *Methodists* Justice. I have known a Clergyman of Note say to another, who had just been preaching a very warm Sermon, "Sir, I do not thank you at all for this. I have no Acquaintance with Mr. *Whitfield* or Mr. *Wesley*. And I do not agree with them in Opinion. But I will have no more *Railing* in my Pulpit."

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

Church of ENGLAND. And did not you at the Beginning of this Letter, make that the *Characterstick* of the ORIGINAL *Methodists*; that they were tenacious of its Rubricks, &c. yes, but "he has no *Connexion* with Mr. *Whitfield* "or *You*," so then now *Connexions* with *You* and Mr. *Whitfield* make the *Methodists*.—Then is not Mr. *Venn* of the Number? And with Regard to Mr. *Mason*, I have really been informed, that he had so far *Connexions*, as to be one of your HEARERS, at Mrs *Gin's* Meeting-House in *Southwark*.

Ab think at least, thy Flock deserve thy Care;

Plants of thy Hand, and Children of thy Prayer, POPE.

Verse 16. But without dwelling upon this; I should have thought, he had been a *Methodist* by his writing for the CAUSE, as you do; and appearing so zealous, as to be before Hand with Mr. *Wesley* himself; but you say, that this is no Consequence: For you knew "a CLERGYMAN of Note, who said to another, "after he had been preaching a very warm " Sermon, that he would have no more Rail- " ing at Mr. *Whitfield*, or Mr. *Wesley* in his " Pulpit."—And yet he was no *Methodist*? Sir, I cannot believe it. I take this old Thief
to

to have been a *Metbodist* in DISGUISE: One of those, who eat the Bread of the Church, and betray its Cause; or leave it to be defended by the poor Creatures, that starve by it. I am countenanced in my Opinion, Sir, by a Man of the best common Sense that ever wrote, who says: *Ni hæc ita essent, non cum illis stares Phædria*. And DIVINE Wisdom itself has assured me, that he, WHO IS NOT AGAINST A THING, IS FOR IT.

But as you and I cannot agree about these I must for *other Reasons*, which the *World* will assent to, if you do not; pronounce Mr. *Mason* and the rest of the People aforementioned, whether they have at present personal *Connexions* with you, who are ORIGINALS or nor, (a *Circumstance* not *essential* to the *Character*, if they are connected in Opinions) to be all METHODISTS. For they are —

“A Set of *Enthusiasts*, who under the *Pretence* of being true Members of the Church
 “of *England*, either prevert its DOCTRINES
 “relating to *Faith* and *Works*, and the *Terms*
 “of Salvation, so as to make them *repugnant* to
 “the *Holy Scriptures*; or else offend against the
 “ORDER and DISCIPLINE of the Church, or
 “further, even attack the *Principles* of *natural*
 “Religion, and still under the *Pretence* of being Members of the Church of *England*, or
 “at least Christians.”

And now Sir, you see what is become of your *ridiculous QUIBBLE*, that the People, who held and published these dangerous Doctrines,
 though

though proved upon them, and though they professed at the same Time, and gloried in the Name of *Methodists*, were not to be called so: because for the present, they were not in *Connection* with You: What is that to the WORLD, or ME? It is enough for us, Sir, that they all correspond so well with the *Definition*. You cannot be ignorant of a noted MAXIM in *Logick*.—*Quod convenit Definitioni convenit DEFINITO*—“What answers to the “*Definition*, answers to the *Thing defined*. (Well, the *Thing defined* was a METHODIST) and you and these People answering to the *Definition*, you and these People answer to the *Thing defined*; and therefore you and these People are all *Methodists*. And are as easily discovered by the Marks, as a *stray-Horse* at *Country-Fair*.

Mr. Wesley's Second Letter.

17 From the Principles of the Methodists you proceed to their Practice. *They hunt, say you, for extraordinary Marks and Revelations. whereby to know the State of the Soul.* The Marks by which I know the State of any Soul, are the inward Fruit of the Spirit, Love, Joy, Peace, Meekness, Gentleness, Goodness, Long-Suffering, Temperance, Patience: Shewn not by Words only, but by the genuine Fruit of Holiness.

Again. *They magnify their Office beyond the Truth, by high Pretences to miraculous Inspiration.* To this Assertion we have answered over and over, we pretend to no other *Inspiration* than that which not only every true Gospel Minister, but every real Christian enjoys.

Again. *The End of all Impostors is some Kind of worldly Gain: And it is difficult for them to conceal their Views entirely. The Love of filthy Lucre will appear, either by the Use they make of it, or the Means of getting it. As to the Use made of it, you are silent. But as to the Means of getting it, you say, Besides, Inhumanity wringing from the Poor, the helpless Widows, the weep-*
Verse

ing Orphans, (The Proof! the Proof!) they creep into Houses, and lead captive silly Women, laden with divers Lusts. 'Tis easy to say this, and ten Times more. But can you prove it? And ought you to say it, 'till you can?

I shall not concern myself with any Thing in your *Appendix*, but what relates to me in particular. This Premised, I observe on No. 1. There are several Instances in my Journals, of Persons that were in *Agonies* of Grief or Fear, and *roared* for the Disquietness of their Heart: Of some that exceeding trembled before God, perhaps fell down to the Ground, and of others whom God in his adorable Providence, suffered to be *lunatic* and sore vexed. The particular Instances hereof, to which you refer, have been largely vindicated already, in the two Letters to the Rev. Dr. Church, as well as that to the late Bishop of London.

In the six following Numbers I am not concerned. The eighth contains those Words from my second Journal, "The rest of the Day we spent in hearing the *wonderful Works*, which God is *beginning* to work all over the Earth." On this likewise I have spoken at large, to Dr. Church and Bishop Gibson. The Sum is: It is a *great Work* when one notorious Sinner is throughly changed in Heart and Life. It is wonderfully great, when God works this entire Change, in a large Number of People: Particularly when it is done in a very short Time: But so He hath wrought in Kingswood, Cornwall, Newcastle. It is therefore a truly *wonderful Work* which God hath now more than begun to work upon Earth.

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

Verse. 17. By *Apologizing* only for yourself in this Place: It is plain, that you acknowledge the Charge against the other *Methodists*; of hunting after extraordinary Marks and Revelations, whereby to know the State of the Soul. The Reader may see a Proof of all this, by perusing Mr. Jones's miraculous LETTER from the *Mansions above*, and the other *Testimonies* printed in the *Appendix* to my Oxford Sermon. And as you profess *Connexions* with Mr. Whitfield; you and your Company of Comedians ought to be told of it afresh, as it is no longer ago

I have now, Sir, briefly answered for myself, which if required, I will do more at large. But I trust, it does already appear, to every impartial Reader, that of the many and heavy Allegations you have brought, with an unparalled Bitterness of Spirit, and an Acrimony of Language almost without Precedent, you have not yet proved One. How far you are to be commended for this (unless by Messrs. *Balls* and the *Monthly Reviewers*) it is not for me to judge: Let all Lovers of Truth, of Humanity and Candor determine. At present I have no more to add, than that I beseech the Father of everlasting Compassion to shew more Mercy to you, than you have shewn to,

Reverend Sir, Your Servant for CHRIST's Sake,

JOHN WESLEY.

Dr. Free's Comment, &c.

ago than about the 8th. of this Month, since Mr. *Whitfield* himself exhibited a Farce of the like Nature, before Sir *Ch—H—* and his FAMILY. One would have thought that a *North-Country* BARONET should have been a Man of *keener Understanding* than to have *persuaded* his Dependents, or commanded his Servants to give Ear to such Delusions. For the Subject of the disorderly *Harangue*, it seems, was this, (if not in the very Words, to the same Purpose) "*That it was the Duty of CHRISTIANS to be continually as inquisitive after News from HEAVEN, as it is the Custom of Politicians to be always inquiring what is done on Earth.*" Which after all the *impudent* * EVASIONS and AFFIDAVITS shews us the *true* Meaning of Mr. *Jones's* Letter, since one of your ORIGINALS could thus publicly inculcate among his Followers, the delusive *Notion* of a *settled Communication* and *Correspondence* between the

* See the Authors REMARKS upon Mr. *Jones's* LETTER and the *Affidavits*, &c. Pag. 21. &c. Sect. III.

invisible World, and this. Does Mr. Jones's LETTER pretend to more?—*Crimine ab uno Disce Omnes*—So little Difference is there between you ORIGINALS, and the NON-ORIGINALS, that you may well be comprehended under the same *Definition*. And therefore from this recent Instance, it appears, that the Observation in my † *Sermon* was just, where laying down *Rules* for the Discovery of *false* PROPHETS, I admonished my Hearers to take Notice, whether *they did not magnify their Office beyond the Truth, by high Pretences to miraculous Inspiration, &c*

To this Assertion you say, you have *answered over and over*: but if this be the Case, you see there is still *Occasion* to answer *again*. And how well you have answered *before*, provided he will take this Relation with him, the Reader has my free Consent to enquire, if he pleases; I would advise him also at the same Time to peruse Mr. Stokes's Letter to the *inspired* Mr. Jones, upon a like Subject, to wit; when *he had his Text immediately from God*, which will expose the weakness of all such *Apolo-*
gies.

For the Matter in the next *Paragraph*, as it came in Question before, it has been replied to (p. 21 of this Pamphlet) already, in the following Sentences, I observe that you drop your *Chicken* Mr. WHITFIELD, which till now you had taken under Wing, leaving all your Incumbrances to shift for yourself. The

† Sermon before the University of Oxford. Pag. 21 new Edit.

Apology for the *Roarers* will never do you any Service, they *roar* so loud, that you cannot be heard. And for the *wonderful Work*, as it stands recorded, it remains a *Wonder* still. You claim indeed some *Merit* for reforming some bad People. I answer *do that which is good*, Sir, and you shall have Praise of the same. But is not here a strange *Dwindling* or falling off from the magnificent Account of Things, which I took Notice of in the *Appendix* to my SERMON? Does not this put you in Mind a little of the Story related by *Ælian*, concerning *Socrates* and *Alcibiades*, when the latter entertained such an high *Conceit* of the Extent of his Possessions, *Socrates*, says the Historian, took him into a Room, where there was a MAP of the World. He bid him look for *Attica*, or the *ATHENIAN Territory* which for it's smallness could scarce be seen; and for his own Possessions, they were *no where* to be found, Taking this Story along with you, pray consider what *Proportion* does *Kingswood*, *Cornwall*, or *Newcastle*, bear to ALL THE EARTH.

Your joining the *Methodist* ROGER BALLS with the MONTHLY REVIEWERS, I am afraid, will do me an *injury* with those GENTLEMEN; as it must put them in Mind, how I once *exalted the Horn* of WILLIAM ROMAINE against them, through which, he has since been *tooting* his *Solomon's SONG*. I say I am afraid, that this was meant as an *Artifice* to move that formidable Body to another Engagement with me, in order to take me off your Hands:

As

As you have felt what they can do, and know, that they and I are not always Friends. If this should come to pass, you will be sufficiently revenged no Doubt for my Severities; which however are meant for your good. For notwithstanding your *dishonest* Quotations; and though for the present, I am obliged by the Times to take my Leave of you, yet in any Thing, that may contribute to your Establishment in the Truth, you may perhaps find me occasionally,

Your very Humble Servant,

Southwark, Nov. 14,

JOHN FREE.

1759.

A short OBSERVATION upon APPEARANCES, and Mr. Wesley's Manner of writing, in this Controversy, addressed to the Publick.

The Reader must perceive, from the HISTORY of these People, and the Accounts they give of their Opinions and of themselves, that their Growth and Increase must be ascribed to other Causes, than the Truth of their Doctrine. Since it appears beyond Contradiction, that their Notions in Religion, are many of them *contrary* to the *Light* of NATURE, the *Attributes* of GOD, and the *fundamental Doctrines* of JESUS CHRIST.

As their System is thus *generally* shocking and detestable in itself; no Art of Man can ever make it worthy of a *rational* Assent. And therefore it is, that we see their great *Apologist* Mr. Wesley, thus shifting from one Opinion to another, as he is reduced to Difficulties, changing
ing

ing his Posture, and even denying his Character to gain some *little Advantage* in his *Defence*. In one Place he is no *Methodist* at all, in another, He is a *Methodist* from the *Beginning*, and *the Father of it*. In his *first Letter*, he engages to refute my "five vehement Positions against the *Methodists*," in *this*, "he has no Concern at all for their *Principles or Practice*." In the *first Letter* he declares, that the *Methodists* would be highly blameable if they "held such Positions, but that they detest them, that they never did." And yet if the *Letter to a Gentleman* be his, it appears, that he, has written against the other *Methodists* for holding such Opinions, HIMSELF. In his *Character of a * Methodist*; they are such *Latitudinarians*, "as not to assent to this, or that Scheme of Religion; *they think*, and let *think*:" in this Letter, the Note is changed, "they are rigid Members of the Church of ENGLAND. This must be a wretched Cause, which in it's Defence, shall lead a Man of Parts and Learning into such *Inconsistencies*, that from hence forward, as a WRITER of APOLOGIES, we must deem him quite extinct.

*Thus all Things have their STAGES and their DATE;
And Man's Devices still submit to FATE,
This great ARCH-METHODIST, who heretofore;
Roar'd till he shook the BOGS † of TULLAMORE,
And making CONVERTS compass'd Sea and Land,
Now falls to pieces, like a Rope of Sand.*

* Pamphlet of Mr. Wesley's pag. 1

† A Place in Ireland, from whence Mr. WESLEY dated his first Letter to Dr. FREE.

In this Pamphlet, some of the capital ERRATA may be thus corrected.

pag. 18. In the Note at the Bottom of the p. *read* v. 7 of this Edition.

19. In the Note at the Bottom, *read* pag. iv.

25. Line 1, for *tha* *read* that, l. 8. for *is* not, *read* it is not, l. 14. for *their*, *read* there.

28. Line 5. *read* Jan. 10. l. 23. for *an*, *read* and Enthusiastick.

29. Line 1, *read* Mack *fun-man*.

31. Line 8, *read* fine new *Picture*.

63. for *ae*, *read* are. Insert at Bottom, Dr. Tucker's.

65. At Bottom, *read* Captivities.

69. For 16, *read* 6.

70. For *or* nor, *read* or not.

71. For 17, *read* 7.

72. the same (the Author craves the *learned* Reader's Indulgence for the rest.)

4 OC 58

